WHAT DO REFORMED EPISCOPALIANS BELIEVE?

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 28 1993
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BX
8071
C43
1888

What Do Reformed Episcopalians Believe?

Eight Sermons preached in Christ Church, Chicago,

— BY —

RT. REV. CHARLES EDWARD CHENEY, D. D.,

Bishop of the Synod of Chicago.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON

APR 28 1993

Issued by

REFORMED EPISCOPAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY, Limited,

1604 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

1888.

(Copyrighted, 1888.)

TO MY BELOVED WIFE,

Whose intelligent loyalty to the Principles, and
Steadfast devotion to the Interests of

THE REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

Suggested the preparation of this little volume, it is
Affectionately Inscribed by

HER HUSBAND.

PREFACE.

The necessity for some work of a character similar to the following sermons, constitutes the only apology for their publication.

It is hardly to be expected that a Church which has only had a separate life of fourteen years, should possess a distinctive literature of its own. Yet it is greatly to the credit of the Reformed Episcopal Church that it has already produced in the form of pamphlets and published sermons, many admirable contributions to its own ecclesiastical history and apologetics.

But the writer of the following discourses has long been convinced that, while certain phases of our polity have been set forth with ability and learning, we have lacked a manual covering the whole field of our distinctive positions.

To the author of this book, and probably also to many of his brethren, it has been a matter of regret that our Church has not heretofore given to the public any explanation or defence of those peculiarities in which she differs from other Evangelical Churches.

Why this is an Episcopal Church; why we conserve the historic Episcopate; why we worship in the use of liturgical forms; why we retain Confirmation as a mode

of admission to full membership of the Church; why we perpetuate the ancient order of the Christian Year with its regularly recurring seasons;—are all questions frequently asked of the Reformed Episcopalian, but to which the literature of his own Church gave no reply. The present volume is a humble attempt to supply this felt want.

Primarily these sermons were preached to a single congregation. The liberality of the Reformed Episcopal Publication Society has given them at once a permanent form and a wider field.

The author desires to express his great obligation to the Rev. H. S. Hoffman, for affording opportunity to consult authorities not easily found in private libraries; to the Rev. Mason Gallagher, D. D., for his aid in the study of some important questions of American Ecclesiastical history, and to the Rt. Rev. Thomas Huband Gregg, D. D., for evidence contained in his correspondence with some of the leading minds of the English Church.

Christ Church, Chicago,
May, 1888.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The Reformed Episcopalian at the Baptismal Font	3
The Reformed Episcopalian and the Rite of Confirmation	26
The Reformed Episcopalian at the Lord's Table	45
The Reformed Episcopalian and his Minister.	67
The Reformed Episcopalian and his Bishop..	84
The Reformed Episcopalian and his Prayer Book	105
The Reformed Episcopalian and the Church Year	128
The Reformed Episcopalian and his Duty to his own Church	147
Appendix	171

THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN AT THE BAPTISMAL FONT.

"*Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" St. Matt. xxviii: 19.

The divisions of the visible Church have often been represented by the rending into fragments of the seamless coat of Christ, from which even the rude soldiers at the Crucifixion shrank.

So sad and pessimistic a view of the condition of Christendom, has its origin in a false notion of what constitutes the real unity of Christ's people.

On that night in Gethsemane, when our Lord began His high priestly work of interceding for those whom He redeemed with His blood, He prayed—"That they may be one—even as we are," Jno. xvii: 11. Did He mean that this oneness was a unity extending to outward form, and visible organism? The answer is in the very language of the prayer itself. He sought that His disciples should be *one, even as He and His Father were one.* But God the Father, throned in dazzling glory, invisible to human eye, yet wielding the forces of

Omnipotence, was *not* one, in any visible form or outward organism, with the Man of Sorrows, who stripped Himself of all glory, who humbled Himself to hunger and thirst—to eat and sleep—to be tempted by the devil and persecuted by men, to be betrayed and mocked and crucified. The perfect unity between the Father and the Son was oneness of nature and will—spiritual and invisible. Christ's prayer then, was that His disciples amidst all visible and organic differences which might exist, should be one in spirit, in heart, in purpose.

Christianity deals with the greatest problems which ever set human thought at work. That all thinking disciples should follow the same paths of reasoning, or arrive at precisely the same conclusions, was never promised by the Master. All attempts to force the followers of Jesus into one and the same intellectual perception of doctrinal truth, have uniformly resulted in a deadening superstition on the one hand, or a re-action into blank unbelief upon the other.

In the streets of our great cities, a huge steam-roller is employed in crushing diverse materials into a uniform pavement In its track are no inequalities. Earth and stone, granite boulders and yielding clay, are perfectly compacted. But the unity resulting is the unity—not of nature—but of artificial power.

The history of European Christianity for many

centuries was the record of an outward and organic unity. But it was that produced by a crushing force. Few are they among believers in this nineteenth century who find in those dark ages the highest type and best example of what the Church of Christ should be. There are certain great facts and principles, embodied in evangelical creeds and confessions, which belong to the whole body of Christ. They constitute the Temple of Divine Truth. They are the common heritage of that true Church which our communion service calls "the blessed company of all faithful people." But while the human mind is constituted as it is, men will differ as to the best and most effective ways in which the common truth can be defended and preserved.

Look for illustration of the point which we are making, to the sphere of education. The young man who comes forth from one of our colleges or public schools, with a strong, well-developed, symmetrical mind, has been beneath the moulding hands of teachers—each of whom was an enthusiast in his own department. One of these instructors felt that he could best build up the mind of his pupil by mathematical science. Another devoted his whole energies to making his youthful charge an adept in the ancient or modern languages. To still a third, the one essential point to be gained, was to imbue that eager intellect with a passionate love for the physical sciences. But in his own

way, each teacher was loyal to the great end and purpose of character building. To have been less enthusiastic in his own department, would have been a wrong wreaked upon his pupil.

So in the Church of Christ. To each of the evangelical communions, one department of essential truth seems the strongest pillar of the temple of the Gospel. To keep that pillar erect—to watch over its safety—to defend it when attacked—is truest loyalty to the Gospel itself.

The Reformed Episcopalian claims no monopoly of the whole truth of God. But he does recognize his responsibility as the representative of certain principles, to neglect which would impair the foundations of the entire building. In deepest loyalty to the Gospel and the King, he claims the right to acquaint himself with, and to make known to others, the methods by which he would aid in upholding the stately structure of universal Christianity.

But where shall be our starting point? Biography begins at the cradle. The geographer in his tracing of a river's course, sets out from its fountain-head. History has its threshold where man appears first on the earth.

So membership of a visible church has its initial point in the solemn rite which Christ ordained as the entrance upon His earthly kingdom. Let this be our sufficient reason for opening this course of

sermons with the topic, "The Reformed Episcopalian at the Baptismal Font."

I. The position assigned to Baptism in the Word of God.

The Reformed Episcopalian is jealous of any essential doctrine which does not find its basis and ultimate authority in the Bible. In this respect, he treats religious principles precisely as the patriotic American deals with the principles of politics. In all that concerns my rights and duties as a citizen of the Republic, I have a profound veneration for the views and interpretations of the constitution which appear in the utterances of Washington, Jefferson, and the Adamses. The words of such men are entitled to due respect. But they can never place any great constitutional question beyond the pale of controversy. The ultimate appeal must be to the constitution itself. In like manner every Reformed Episcopal clergyman, whether he be deacon, presbyter, or bishop, is required by his ordination vow to teach nothing as essential to salvation, except that which he is persuaded is taught in Holy Scripture, or may be clearly proven by it.

Little wonder if so solemn a promise should affect his teaching upon points which are not absolutely essential to salvation. Even in regard to matters of smaller moment, the Reformed Episco-

palian desires to know whether God's written Word has borne its testimony.

But no careful student of the Scriptures will come to the conclusion that baptism is a subject of trifling importance.

There are no less than seventy-six passages in the New Testament which deal with this question. God has not thrust it into a corner. It is as impossible to read the Bible, and ignore the allusions to baptism, as to scan the midnight heavens, and forget the existence of the stars.

But the importance of the rite is not to be gauged merely by the frequency with which it is mentioned. There is a far more weighty evidence. The Lord Jesus Christ Himself insisted upon being baptized. He had no sins to be washed away. Surely, He needed not to have the element of water applied to His blessed person as symbol of such spiritual cleansing. Yet such importance did He attach to this symbolic use of water, as a teacher of man's sinfulness, and need of inward cleansing—that He compelled John the Baptist to baptize Him. Matt. iii: 13-15.

Isaiah had foretold seven hundred years before, that Christ should "be numbered among the transgressors." Sinless Himself—He yet was baptized, that in all respects He might be identified with sinners.

His ministry was marked by the baptism of

those who became His followers. Though He "baptized not" with His own hands, His disciples administered that rite to more converts than even John had baptized at the waters of the Jordan. John iv: 1, 2.

Go one step further. The last words of a father to his children, do not deal with trifles. The final instructions of a general to the officers who lead an army to desperate battle, concern the points vital to success. Yet the latest words which Jesus spoke to those whom He sent forth to bear His banner to the ends of the earth, imposed on them a command to baptize all who through their Gospel should believe on Him. Matt. xxviii: 19.

The Reformed Episcopalian plants his feet firmly on the Scripture when he proclaims the momentous nature of the sacrament of baptism. For, as he pushes on his study of the New Testament, he meets the fact that the command of the Master was carried out by His inspired apostles. It would be difficult to recall in the pages of the Acts, a solitary record of conversion—whether it be that of Saul of Tarsus, of the 3000 Jews on the day of Pentecost, of the jailor at Philippi, or of Lydia, the purple-seller of Thyatira—in which the yielding of the heart to Christ, is not followed by the "confession of the mouth" in baptism. The Reformed Episcopalian does not say with the Roman Church that there is no possibility of sal-

vation without this symbolic cleansing. He has no proof that the penitent thief had ever been baptized. Nor can he limit God's mercy where a repentant and believing soul may be placed in circumstances which make the act of baptism impossible. He does not pretend to make himself a judge of such believers as may be found, for example, in the Society of Friends, who have been misled by a false spiritualizing of a positive command of Christ. To their own Master they must stand or fall. But he does hold with unwavering firmness to the simple fact, that the Bible clearly declares it the duty of every believer to confess his faith by a baptism with water in the name of the Holy Trinity. Such a fact lifts the baptismal washing out of the realm of mere optional ceremonial. It makes it obligatory on every soul who trusts in Jesus and would do His will.

II. It is this same fidelity to the Word of God, which compels the Reformed Episcopalian to believe that THE QUANTITY OF WATER USED IN SYMBOLIZING THE SPIRIT'S POWER TO PURIFY, IS A MATTER WHICH DOES NOT CONCERN HIM.

He is willing to yield all honor and Christian regard to brethren who refuse to admit to the table of the Lord those Christians who have not received baptism by immersion. But it is a deep conviction of Scripture truth which leads him to protest against what seems to him such unbrotherly

exclusion. For it is the Bible which makes baptism with water a symbol of the soul's spiritual cleansing through the work of the Holy Spirit. It is the Bible which teaches that the other sacrament is a symbol of the soul's feeding by faith on a crucified Saviour.

The Reformed Episcopalian cannot help asking why the quantity of bread and wine should not be prescribed in the Lord's supper, if the quantity of water must be prescribed in baptism? If a morsel of bread—a taste of wine—which in themselves satisfy neither bodily hunger, nor bodily thirst, are yet sufficient to symbolize how Jesus satisfies the soul—why should not as much water as the hollow of the hand will hold, be sufficient of that cleansing element to *symbolize* how Jesus by His Spirit purifies the heart?

The limits of this sermon forbid an extended argument. Let it suffice to say that the Greek verb βαπτιζω, from which we get our word "baptize," has never been proven to mean the total immersion of the body in water. Both Plutarch and Xenophon among the classic Greek authors use it with reference to the sprinkling which a gardener bestows upon his plants. Is there any evidence that when this word, far older than the New Testament, came to be enlisted in the service of the Gospel writers, its former classic meaning was altogether changed? On the contrary, there is not

one passage where we are compelled to believe that it meant a complete submersion.

I can only give one or two examples. I refer you for a fuller investigation to a most unanswerable tract of the Rev. William H. Cooper, D. D., a venerable presbyter of our own Church, entitled, "*Facts for the Unprejudiced.*"

St. Mark, speaking of the Pharisees, says, "When they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not" Mark vii: 4. In the original it reads, "Except they *baptize* themselves." But we know that the ceremony referred to certainly did not involve an immersion of the whole body previous to every act of eating; for this last purification was reserved for cases of special ceremonial defilement.

St. Luke tells us that the Pharisee who had invited our Lord to dinner, was shocked because Jesus "had not first washed"—in the Greek, "baptized himself." Luke xi: 37, 38. Can we believe that the host expected every guest to totally submerge himself as a preparation for the feast?

Again St Mark speaks of the Pharisaic ceremony of the washing—or in the original—the "baptism" of "tables," or, as it may be rendered, "couches." Were the tables of a Jewish house totally immersed? Are we to believe that some vat or baptistery was universally provided by the Pharisees for such a purpose?

John the Baptist predicted that Jesus should "baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire," Matt. iii: 11. The fulfillment came upon the day of Pentecost. But how? The author of the Book of Acts replies, "There appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire; and *it sat upon* each of them." Acts ii: 3. They certainly were not immersed in fire. Again, when Peter preached to Cornelius and his household, "the Holy Ghost," we are told, "*fell upon* all them which heard the Word." Acts x: 44. They were not immersed in the Holy Spirit. Yet when Peter comes to describe the scene to the disciples at Jerusalem, he describes it as a *baptism*. "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that He said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Acts xi: 16.

But the passage most frequently urged as settling the whole question, is in St. Paul's epistle to the Romans. It reads, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Rom. vi: 3–6.

Our friends who claim that there is no baptism except in immersion, declare that the figurative expression "buried with Him," must be literally

carried out by the entire burial of the baptized person in water.

It seems incredible that this purely figurative language should be thus pressed to literal and minute conclusions by excellent and learned men. For in the very same passage, St. Paul also asserts that we are "*planted* together in the likeness of His death." Why should we not carry into literal details this figure also?

Or when the apostle adds, "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him"—why not with equal reason press the figure to mean a literal stretching of the Christian on a cross?

It would be an easy task to prove that all the monuments of the primitive Church, the pictorial inscriptions of the early Christians on the walls of the catacombs, as well as the recorded history of ancient Christianity, unanimously show that baptism was performed either by immersion, by sprinkling, or by a combination of both (*vide* "Apostolic Baptism," by C. Taylor). But the Reformed Episcopalian rests his persuasion upon the written word of God. From that he knows no appeal.

III. We attest the genuineness of every important document by a seal. BAPTISM IN ALL BRANCHES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, IS THE SEAL SET TO THE MOST IMPORTANT TRANSACTION WHICH CAN TAKE PLACE BETWEEN A HUMAN SOUL AND ITS MAKER AND

Redeemer. It attests the *covenant* entered into between the sinner and his Saviour in the hour that, penitent and believing, the soul receives Christ as its only atoning sacrifice.

Jesus invites—"Come unto Me." The soul responds by a trustful and loving surrender. But the surrender is not completed in all its fulness, until the seal of baptism has been set to the solemn yet joyful transfer. But the Reformed Episcopalian cannot forget that Christ never invited adults alone He did not merely ask men and women to "come." He said, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me." Mark. x: 14. His invitation and command was that parents who believed on Him should dedicate their offspring by a complete surrender, even as themselves. Surely, He meant that the infant equally with the parent, should receive the *seal* of such surrender. His *reason* for requiring the children to be brought to Him makes the case still stronger. "For," He says, "*of such is the kingdom of heaven.*" He declares as plainly as words can speak, that the children of believing parents are members of His kingdom and Church. We have His word for it. Can anything be more unscriptural than to refuse to the very class of souls whom Jesus has thus pointed out as members of His kingdom, the seal by which that membership is witnessed?

Moreover, as the Reformed Episcopalian follows

His Lord to the close of His earthly career, he hears Him giving His special commission to the pardoned and restored Apostle Peter. He lays it upon the conscience of His penitent disciple that he is to "feed" His "sheep." But as if it were even more a duty, He *first* says, "Feed My *lambs*." John xxi : 15–17. Then the lambs belong to Christ. Equally with the sheep, they are in His flock and His fold. Would the "Good Shepherd" put His mark, His seal, His sign, upon the sheep, and not upon the lambs?

Nor can the Reformed Episcopalian forget that when the apostles went forth in Pentecostal power and wisdom, they baptized whole families. Lydia of Thyatira was baptized, "*and her house*," —an expression which is the exact equivalent of our word "family." Acts xvi : 15. Not only did Paul and Silas baptize the Philippian jailor, but "*all his*." Acts xvi : 33. St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthian Church, does not take the trouble to say whether or not he baptized Stephanas, the head of a household; but does place it on record that he baptized *his family*. 1 Cor. i : 16. Incredible, indeed, does it seem to the Reformed Episcopalian, that if the Jewish custom of receiving the little ones formally into the Church by a distinct and appointed ceremony, was departed from by the early Christians, no command to that effect was given, and no controversy sprang up about so inexplicable

an omission. To the Reformed Episcopalian, the subject is intensely practical. All history attests that in the early Church, believing parents realized a responsibility for their children's Gospel training, which is sadly wanting among members of the Church to-day. The primitive Christian realized that in solemn dedication, his child had been given to Christ. It was the parent's duty and privilege so to surround the child from its very cradle with the atmosphere of Christian truth, and prayer, and daily instruction, that the child should grow up into a sense of its own responsibility for the fulfillment of parental promises. The secret of much that made the first centuries of Christianity what they were, lay in this family religion, ever stimulated and sustained by the consciousness in both parents and children, that alike they had been dedicated to the Lord.

Those early disciples did not leave their offspring to first hear the elements of the Gospel from the lips of a Sunday school teacher. Nor did they believe that their little ones must grow up in the darkness of alienation from God, till some revival should let in a sudden flash of spiritual light.

If parents among Reformed Episcopalians will follow the leadings of their Church, it will make infant baptism universal among us, and will make it a reality and a power—not a superstitious and meaningless form.

IV. Fidelity to the Bible compels the Reformed Episcopalian to enter his solemn PROTEST AGAINST THE THEORY THAT THE NEW BIRTH IS INSEPARABLY TIED TO BAPTISM.

When our Pilgrim Fathers left native land, and family ties, and sweet associations in old England, to make a new home and nation across the sea, the world had a right to ask what drove them from the country of their birth. Fourteen years ago, some of us turned away with sad hearts and bitter tears, from associations sweet and precious as native land or childhood's home. The world has a right to ask what drove us out from our mother Church. The full answer will be given as this course progresses. But *one* of the causes which forced that separation, belongs to my theme to-day. Our old-time prayer book required its ministers to declare immediately upon the baptism of an infant or adult, that the baptized person was then and there *born again of the Spirit of God* (*vide* Baptismal Offices, Prot. Epis. Prayer Book). A babe is brought to the baptismal font, "a child of wrath" (*vide* Church Catechism). The water of baptism is put upon its brow, and lo! then for the first time, the minister lifts up his voice to God in this thanksgiving, "*We thank Thee that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit.*"

To every evangelical Christian, the new birth is that "creative act of the Holy Ghost, by which He

imparts to the soul a new spiritual life." Yet our former prayer-book service tied this work of the Omnipotent God, wonderful as the original creation of man, to a ceremony performed by a sinful creature. We recognized the fact that experience showed that very often none of the fruits of the Spirit were brought forth by those who had been baptized. We were startled by the Bible testimony that Simon Magus, baptized by apostolic hands, was yet "in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity." Acts viii: 23. We appealed to our high church leaders for Scripture proof that the new birth was inseparably tied to baptism with water. They pointed us to Christ's language to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." John iii: 5. We saw that Christ clearly taught that His disciples must be baptized both with water and the Holy Spirit. But we could not find one word in Jesus' solemn utterance to the Jewish rabbi, which said, "The baptism with water *insures* the baptism of the Spirit." I may say to the newly-landed immigrant, "Except you be naturalized, and filled with the spirit of your adopted country, you cannot be an American." But I dare not say, "Take the step of legal naturalization, and the spirit of patriotic devotion will of necessity come with it."

Then we were pointed to St. Paul's words to Titus, "According to His mercy He saved us by

the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Titus iii : 5

But to assume that "the washing of regeneration" was baptismal washing, was simply to beg the question at issue. Nor only so; but we perceived that St. Paul brought out this "washing of regeneration," as something specially *in contrast* to "works of righteousness which we have done." By these works he asserted we were *not* saved. But in the case of the vast majority of the Christians in the days of Paul and Titus, including both of themselves, the act of baptism was the deliberate act of an adult, voluntarily done *as a work of righteousness.* It, therefore, could not be "the washing of regeneration" referred to by the apostles.

Still, again, we were reminded that St. Peter declares, "Baptism doth also now save us." 1 Pet. iii : 21. But we could not fail to read the rest of the verse, "*not* the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God."

In a word, evangelical ministers in the Protestant Episcopal Church, found themselves pushed into this fearful position. They found no evidence in the Scriptures that regeneration was uniformly wrought by the act of baptism. God's Spirit was free. John iii : 8. He might new create the soul in the hour of the baptismal rite, or before, or afterwards. Yet, every such minister must give up the use of the

baptismal service, or else in solemn words of thanksgiving to God, publicly declare that which he did not believe to be God's truth.

Do not imagine that such a dilemma faced the low churchmen of the English and American Episcopal Church, *for the first time*, when the controversy arose which resulted in the Reformed Episcopal Church. Evangelical ministers and laymen had groaned under the bondage of the baptismal service from the days of the Reformation. They perceived the awful chasm which yawned between the plain teachings of the Gospel, and the words which the prayer book put into the mouth of the officiating minister. They saw how, under the literal teaching of the baptismal service, the souls of sinners were imperilled. Believing themselves to be regenerated by God's Holy Spirit in the act of baptism, and thus saved by the baptismal washing, men came to trust their entire hope for eternity to an outward and mechanical ceremony.

They saw, too, that a more than Romish superstition pervaded the minds of the humble and unlettered members of the Church, leading them to believe that the unbaptized infant must certainly perish. They heard from high church pulpits the echo of the language of such teachers as Bishop Mant, who proclaimed that in baptism we have "a new principle put into us, and sanctification and purity unspotted are attributed to the Church of Christ as

the effect of the washing of water." They heard it asserted in the language of the same prelate, that "baptism is the new birth." And when, with the Bible in their hands, they refuted such false doctrine, their own people pointed them to the baptismal service, and asked, "Do you not, every time you baptize with water, pray God to 'sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin'? Do you not, when the application of water has been made, turn to the people, and say, 'Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this child (or this person) is regenerate, let us give thanks'? Do you not then before the searcher of hearts say, 'We thank Thee that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this child (or this person) with Thy Holy Spirit'?"

Do you ask how such low churchmen—honest, conscientious, God-fearing, managed to stay in the old Church, and repeat on every baptismal occasion a statement which they believed to be inconsistent with the word of God? I can best answer that question from my own experience. I satisfied my conscience, through many years of ministry in the Protestant Episcopal Church, by trying to *explain away* the language of the service. Two or three widely different theories had been put forth by low church theologians, either one of which, it was believed, would bridge over the abyss between the prayer book and the Bible. One of these was that the service spoke of a sort of *ecclesiastical* regener-

ation, a new birth into the visible Church, rather than into the spiritual life.*

Another was that the service spoke what was called, "the judgment of charity." In other words, it charitably took for granted that the baptized infant or adult *would* repent and believe, and God *would* give His spiritual new birth to that soul. It told the minister to imagine himself for the moment far down the future, supposing repentance and faith to have been exercised, and regeneration therefore to have been imparted. On such an hypothesis he could speak of what might be, as though it were accomplished, and so declare to God his thankfulness for it! That good and great men in the evangelical party could satisfy their consciences with so artificial and unnatural an explanation, only showed how hard pressed low churchmen were to find some method to fill up the gulf between the Bible and the baptismal service.†

There came a day when conscience told me that I was juggling with plain words, to torture from them that which they did not mean. The service did not speak of the future, but of *what had just now been accomplished* by the application of water. "We thank Thee that it *hath* pleased Thee to regenerate this person."

In agony of soul, I turned to the other explanation. Did not the baptismal service mean that a new birth was wrought by baptism only in the

* Vide Appendix, A. † Vide Appendix, B.

sense of introducing the baptized person into the new world of *Church privileges?* Was it not a sacramental and ecclesiastical, instead of spiritual regeneration, of which the prayer book spoke?

But the language of the service refused this "flattering unction" to my soul. It met me with the plain words, "that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate *with Thy Holy Spirit*" Surely that meant not ecclesiastical, but *spiritual* regeneration!

I had reached a point where I must choose, in God's sight, between the baptismal service and the Bible. You know the result. But God had been working upon other minds and consciences as He had upon my own.

When at last the Reformed Episcopal Church stood forth full-panoplied for its great conflict, it was with a baptismal service which echoes the teaching of the word of God. It struck out the assertion which made baptism with water the unfailing channel of regeneration. It made its message, reiterated every time the sacrament is performed, a clear enunciation of the truth that baptism is *a sign and seal* of spiritual regeneration, but not that regeneration itself. I ask, then, in closing, that your cordial love and devotion be given to a Church which is true to the word of God, upon a question which meets us at the very threshold of the visible kingdom of Christ.

"Sire," said an American engineer to the Czar

Nicholas, of Russia, "I have marked out the course of your projected railway on this map. We must avoid this range of mountains here. There, we must follow the tortuous valley of the river. And at this point we must touch an important town by deflecting from a straight course."

The Czar took his pencil, and drawing a straight line from terminus to terminus, said, "We will build the road on that line."

Our old prayer book of the Protestant Episcopal Church veered to right and left of the Scripture line in its baptismal service. But God drew the unerring course of the Bible with the pencil of the Holy Ghost, and said to the Reformed Episcopal Church, "Build there." We have honestly and prayerfully tried to do it.

THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN AND THE RITE OF CONFIRMATION.

"*Of the doctrine of baptisms and of laying on of hands.*" Heb. vi: 2.

A general sameness never wakens curiosity. But on the other hand, singularity always excites our interest. A man appearing in the strange dress of some remote country, stands out in such contrast to the monotonous and colorless character of our Anglo-Saxon attire, that we cannot help fixing our eyes upon him.

The same general principle holds good in the sphere of religion. The peculiarity of speech and dress which characterizes a Quaker, and the singularity of garb and manner distinguishing the sisterhoods of the Roman Church, attract our notice far more than the every-day and common-place appearance of other equally devoted and spiritually-minded Christians. In portions of our own country, there is a sect of which few persons would have ever heard, but for the fact that they maintain, as a sort of sacrament, the ceremony of washing each other's feet, in literal imitation of our Divine Lord.

The rite of confirmation, or reception of believers into the full membership of the Church by "the laying on of hands," is no novelty in universal Christendom. Out of the four hundred and twenty-five millions of nominal Christians in the world, three hundred and forty millions admit their members by some form involving this imposition of hands. Confirmation is not merely the inheritance of the Episcopal Churches of England and America, but of that vast body of Protestants on both sides of the sea, who bear the name and cherish the teachings of the great Reformer, Luther.

The rite is sedulously preserved by that singularly pure and spiritual body of believers, who have sprung from the persecuted Waldenses—the members of the Moravian Church.

The statistics of Protestantism show that confirmation is the chosen method of admission to the visible fold of Christ, among one-half of that portion of Christendom which denies the authority, and rejects the superstitions of the Greek and Roman Churches.

But on the other hand, it is equally true that to the majority of evangelical Christians in the United States, this ancient ordinance is something which has the aspect of a stranger and an alien.

And very naturally so. For this country owes its evangelization, to a large degree, to three great branches of the Christian Church—neither of

which has retained the rite of confirmation. Th Puritans of New England rejected this ceremon when they refused to be ruled by bishops. Th Presbyterian Church, against the preferences c Calvin, dropped confirmation as early as the day of the Reformation.

While John Wesley lived, the members of his re ligious societies never separated from the Churc of England, and were generally confirmed in it parish churches. But in America, from the first the Methodist Church, which Providence made th pioneer of the Gospel to our Western States, fol lowed another mode of publicly confessing Christ No wonder then, that when American evangelism has been advanced so largely by churches t which confirmation is unknown, the masses of ou Protestant worshippers look upon that ordinanc as a singular peculiarity. A Christian trained from infancy in some one of our sister churches enters for the first time an Episcopal place of wor ship. It happens to be on a Sunday when a band of young believers are publicly to give their alle giance to the Saviour. Such a scene awakens n surprise. He is used to similar occasions. Bu when he learns that the officiating minister who re ceives these souls into the visible Kingdom o Christ, is not the pastor of this flock, but an over seer of many congregations, he naturally demand an explanation. Still more is he surprised by th

singularity of the ceremony, when with solemn prayer for God's defending grace, the bishop lays his hands separately upon the head of each one of these new confessors of the faith. So marked is the difference from the familiar modes of public profession of Christ's name, that it raises a whole brood of inquiries in his mind. While he may not question the solemnity and beauty of the ceremony he witnesses, it yet has such singularity, that he justly seeks some adequate explanation of it.

To afford such inquirers the answer to which they are entitled, is the purpose which I have in view in this sermon. Let us ask then, WHAT REASONS HAS THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN TO GIVE FOR THE RITE OF CONFIRMATION?

A builder feels a natural satisfaction when he finds himself able to lay the foundation-stones on a basis of bed-rock. It would perhaps be a similar satisfaction that the advocate of confirmation would experience, if he discovered in the New Testament that Christ had clearly and unequivocally commanded this precise observance.

Yet it would be a pleasure mingled with keenest pain. For such a command would put the rite of confirmation on the same level with baptism and the supper of the Lord.

It would make it imperative on all who acknowledge the authority of Christ. To refuse or to neglect to be confirmed, would be rebellion against

our King. It would brand one-half of Protestantism with the stigma of disloyalty to Jesus. Of what worth the Puritan's stern piety, the Presbyterian's devotion to Gospel truth, the Methodist's spiritual enthusiasm, if these Christians openly refused obedience to a requirement of Christ Himself? The broadest charity could not cover with its mantle, so flagrant a revolt against the Master.

But to such a position no Reformed Episcopalian is driven. The man who grasps too much, at last will grasp thin air. He who attempts to claim for confirmation the authority of Christ, weakens the cause for which he pleads.

Let us frankly and candidly admit that there exists in the New Testament no trace of such a Divine appointment.

At the same time, however, the Reformed Episcopalian does not allow that the rite of confirmation finds no sanction or warrant in the Scripture. If the canon of Holy Writ ended with the four Gospels, we should find no Bible sanction for many of the institutions and practices which the whole Church of God holds dear.

There is no record that the Lord Himself commanded the appointment of deacons, or authorized the establishment of such an office. But the fact that the apostles, under the influence of the Holy Spirit as they were, chose the seven, Acts vi: 5,

has led the universal Church to follow their example.

Has it ever occurred to you that you can put your finger upon no text of the New Testament where Jesus ever directed the Lord's supper to be administered to women, or even to any lay member of the Church? It was in an assembly of apostles only, it was in a gathering of men exclusively, that He commanded, "Do this in remembrance of Me." Matt. xxvi: 20. But the later practice of the apostles themselves has settled all question, if any ever arose, as to the right of all genuine believers to commemorate the Saviour's love

When Philip the Evangelist had preached the Gospel with such power in the City of Samaria, that multitudes "both of men and women" turned to the Lord, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Now notice what follows The apostles at Jerusalem hear of this glorious awakening in Samaria. And forthwith Peter and John—not pastors of congregations—not deacons, like Philip—but higher officers of the new-born Church, and representatives of the whole body of believers—are despatched to the scene of Philip's labors—for what? To pray for these new disciples, and to lay their hands upon their heads. Acts vii: 7. If this were an isolated case, we might perhaps suppose that it was an exception to the general rule of apostolic prac-

tice. But the nineteenth chapter of the Acts reveals to us the great apostle to the Gentiles preaching Christ in the rich and dissolute city of Ephesus.

Among his hearers are some who had been prepared for accepting Christ by the teachings of John the Baptist or some of his disciples. They knew no other baptism than that which Christ's stern herald had administered as a symbol of repentance. Paul baptizes them. But he does not stop with this obedience to the last command of Jesus. He "laid his hands upon them." Acts xix: 6.

The careful and candid reader of the New Testament will naturally ask the question, "Why was the sacrament of baptism, ordained as it was by Christ Himself, supplemented by this imposition of hands?" What necessity existed that those already sealed to Christ by the baptismal sign, should submit to another and additional ceremony? The Reformed Episcopalian answers for himself and for his Church, that such an ordinance would have a two-fold significance and value. It would renew in the most solemn way the consecration to Christ which baptism had previously made. It would involve confirming before a higher officer of the Church, the covenant into which the soul had entered at baptism. Such a re-consecration and such a confirmation of the covenant, if sincere, is always a means of grace. Not in any mystic or

superstitious sense; but because by it the soul is stirred anew, and love and faith revived. Nor only this; but when such public renewal of baptismal engagements was made before one who represented, as the apostles did, no local church or congregation, but the whole body of believers; and when such a messenger of the Church at large, sealed the act by the imposition of his hands, it was peculiarly significant. For it substantially said to the young believer, "Your baptismal obligations bind you not merely to the little flock in Samaria, in Ephesus, in Corinth or in Thessalonica; they do not introduce you into loving fellowship only with the pastor whose preaching led you to Jesus; but they make you one of that larger and broader communion composed of all who love the Lord."

Now let us do full justice to those who hold a different view of the imposition of the apostles' hands, from that maintained by the advocates of confirmation.

It is forcibly argued that both in Samaria and Ephesus, the extraordinary and visible manifestation of the Holy Ghost followed the laying on of hands.

There were some miraculous and supernatural gifts bestowed upon these new members of the Church, like those upon the Day of Pentecost when the disciples spake in languages which they had never learned.

"The imposition of hands," say the opponents of confirmation, "was solely to accomplish this result. The Holy Ghost was visibly bestowed by the touch of the apostles. That was the purpose and end of the ceremony. But the age of miracles passed away. And since such outward, visible and supernatural gifts of the Spirit are no longer the heritage of God's children, the ceremony through which they were imparted, has no business in the Church. It is like the ceremony of a royal coronation maintained in a republic where kings are no longer known."

I believe this to be a full and fair statement of the objections urged against any Scripture sanction for the rite of confirmation.

But no chain is stronger than one of its links. The argument which I have tried to state in its full force, depends wholly upon one supposed fact; that the *sole object* of the apostolic laying on of hands was to impart the Holy Ghost in His supernatural gifts. But is that a fact? Once every week I wind my clock. The result is, that with every sixty minutes which elapse, a hammer strikes the gong, and the bell tells the hour. But no man would argue that this striking of the hour was the sole object which I had in view when I used the key. There was a more important end to be secured, in confirming the regular movement of the

wheels, and the forward march of the hands on the dial plate.

Miracles and extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were never the most important things in the Church of Christ. Because supernatural powers followed the imposition of apostolic hands, we have no right to conclude that the ceremony had no other purpose whatsoever.

Notice too, how this view is strengthened by the history of the Apostolic Church. That record clearly shows that the laying on of hands was not necessary to the giving of supernatural powers of the Holy Ghost.

There was no imposition of the apostles' hands upon the other disciples on the Day of Pentecost. Yet "they were *all* filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Acts ii: 4.

We have no account of Peter laying his hands on the household of Cornelius. But the Holy Ghost fell on them also in the gift of tongues. Acts x: 44–46.

Nothing then can be clearer than this; that it is a mistake to assume that the sole end of this rite was to secure the miraculous influences of the Spirit. There were other ways in which the gifts of the Holy Ghost were bestowed. The conclusion is irresistible that the laying on of hands, while it was accompanied in apostolic days by the wonders

of spiritual power, had some wider and more permanent end in view.

The argument that, because miraculous gifts were anciently given with the laying on of hands, therefore the rite must cease when supernatural powers were no longer the possession of the Church, proves too much.

For God bore witness with these gifts to the act of united prayer. Acts iv: 31 He followed the preaching of the word by imparting the gift of tongues to Cornelius and his household. Acts xi: 15. Shall we therefore reason that united prayer is no longer to be continued; and that preaching should be dropped from the agencies of the Church?

But there is a crowning evidence for the permanency of the imposition of hands, to which I have not yet alluded.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, Heb. vi; 2, alludes to three pairs or couples of religious doctrines, as being among the foundations of the truth. "Therefore," says the sacred writer, "leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and faith toward God; of the doctrine of baptisms and of laying on of hands; of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."

Now if the imposition of hands was some rite

belonging only to the early age of Christianity, and not meant to be a permanent ordinance—how does it come to pass that the New Testament thus puts it among "the principles of the doctrine of Christ," which enter into the very "foundation" of the truth? How does it come to be named in the midst of facts and realities as momentous as repentance and faith—as enduring as the resurrection and the judgment? Albert Barnes replies that it may refer to the act of ordination of ministers, or to the laying on of hands to heal the sick, or yet again to the act by which the miraculous powers of the Spirit were imparted by apostolic hands.

The Reformed Episcopalian is willing to admit that it *may* have meant any one of these. He cheerfully concedes that it *may* have involved any laying on of hands as a religious ceremony—though it were but that of a father blessing his child. Gen. xlviii: 14. But why should such acts as these be classed with most solemn and momentous verities? Above all, why should "the laying on of hands" be yoked with "baptisms," precisely as "faith" is yoked with "repentance," and "eternal judgment" with "the resurrection"? Is it uncharitable to other Christians; is it a leaning to superstition; which compels him to believe that he is following the practice of the apostles in adhering to this special form of reception to the Church?

Time forbids more than a bare allusion to reasons which have their weight, though lying outside the Word of God.

The history of early Christianity after the days of the apostles, is full of references to this rite as universally prevailing in the Church. Precisely like the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, confirmation seems to have come down in undisputed practice from the apostolic example. Is it argued that it became an empty mummery, abused to the ends of priestcraft and superstition? True! but the same abuse characterized for ages the two sacraments of baptism and the supper of the Lord.

Moreover, the very fact that the vast majority of evangelical Christians maintain the practice of infant baptism, renders absolutely necessary *some* method of public admission to the Church, of those baptized in childhood. Dedicated by Christian parents to the Saviour's service, shall there be no way opened by which the young Christian can assume all the responsibilities of such a consecration? Is there to be given no special and public act in which he can voluntarily say that the repentance and faith which were hoped for and prayed for at his baptism, are now his own? Every Church which baptizes its children, has some ceremony to receive them when personally repentant and believing, on their voluntary confession of Christ.

The Reformed Episcopalian has no word of disparagement for any appropriate form which others may adopt He only claims that none can be more appropriate, more solemn, more beautiful, or more in accord with "apostolic practice," than confirmation.

But why ask those baptized in adult years, to submit to this additional ceremonial? The answer is two-fold. We follow the example of the apostles, who laid their hands upon the heads of those who had in mature life been openly baptized. But beside this pattern set before us, we recognize a *practical* value in the confirmation of those baptized in adult years.

A bishop presides over many parishes. His visits to each necessarily cannot be frequent. But when he does come for the administration of this rite, it affords an opportunity for those who have been led to Christ, and who have confessed that faith, to renew their baptismal obligations. It is a deepening of the inscription which baptism engraved upon the heart.

It may be added that there are few greater evils in the Church of Christ, than the selfish and narrow isolation of a single church. There is a tendency on the part of an individual parish to become like a railway train, following the narrow course which its own track marks, and its own head-light illuminates, regardless of all that may be on either

side. But confirmation is an act in which an official of a larger organization participates. The provision which gives the act of administering this rite into the hands of the bishop, emphasizes the principle that the person confirmed, thereby becomes not a member of this congregation or that parish, but a member of the whole Reformed Episcopal Church. He thereby pledges himself to its welfare and its progress.

The Reformed Episcopalian finds his love for this solemn ordinance deepened, when he discovers that his broad, catholic, and spiritual view of confirmation has met with the approval of the great leaders of Christendom. Some of the best of those who have chosen another method of confessing Christ, have given to this rite the warmest commendation.

John Calvin boldly declares: "It was an ancient custom of the Church for the children of Christians, after they were come to years of discretion, to be presented to the bishop in order to fulfil that duty which was required of adults who offered themselves for baptism." The great apostle of Presbyterianism then attacks the Roman Catholic perversion of the rite, and adds, "Such imposition of hands therefore, as is simply connected with benediction, I highly approve, and wish it were now restored to its primitive use, uncorrupted by superstition." (Calvin's Institutes, Vol. II, p. 605)

The same testimony to the antiquity and value of confirmation was repeated in a report of a committee on the subject—appointed some years ago by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. (Vide "Common Prayer Interpreted;" p. 310.)

Richard Baxter—as pure a saint as modern times have known—himself a Presbyterian, wrote a carefully prepared argument for confirmation. (Baxter's Works, Vol. XIV.)

The early Methodists were generally confirmed in the parish churches of England. Adam Clarke, long after he was a Wesleyan preacher, presented himself for confirmation to the Bishop of Bristol. Forty years afterward, he writes of this step, "Upon this point my sentiments are not changed." (Life of Adam Clarke; Vol. I, p. 94)

Dr. Richard S. Storrs, a very Nestor of the Congregational Churches, has introduced a mode of public recognition of baptized children, which partakes of some of the features of our confirmation. (*Christian at-Work.*)

The sweetest and most nutritious bread may be made the vehicle of poison. God has given us nothing which may not be abused and perverted from its true purpose. The rite of confirmation affords no exception to the rule. Upon it a fungus-growth of evils developed in the Church from which our own sprang, that largely contributed to

produce the separation of the Reformed Episcopalian.

Yet these evils were not the result of the ordinance itself. We clearly saw that thousands of young persons were brought forward for confirmation, with no preparation of heart, and no adequate sense of the solemnity of the act. It crowded the church with a membership of souls lacking the essential requirement of spiritual membership of Christ. Yet when we came to revise the service for confirmation, it was scarcely changed from its old form. It needed no such alteration as the baptismal office, to make its voice chord with the Bible. The trouble was not in the service for confirmation.

But it lay deeper. The false theory of the office of a bishop, to which I shall refer in a later sermon of this course, poisoned the wholesome bread of the doctrine of confirmation.

Bishop Doane declared that "the bishops are apostles." (Bishop G. W. Doane's Missionary Bishop, p. 22.)

The "Tracts for the Times," which first turned the Protestant Episcopal Church Romeward, speak of bishops as "the representatives of the apostles." The same authority tells us that the bishops are to be considered "as if they were apostles." "The apostles may still be said to be among us. Whatever we ought to do, had we lived when the

apostles were still alive, the same ought we to do for the bishops" "The bishop rules the whole Church below, as Christ rules it above" "Our bishops are armed with *the apostles' power to confer spiritual gifts.*"

How inevitable—how logical the result! The apostles bestowed spiritual gifts by the touch of the hand. The same power must belong to their successors. Thus confirmation becomes a magical rite, dependent for its value and efficacy solely upon the contact of an Episcopal hand.

The Reformed Episcopalian purified the rite of confirmation when he showed from the New Testament that the apostles had no successors in their unique and solitary work. He made the laying on of hands something more than a superstitious and mechanical act, when He made the bishop simply a presiding minister, receiving the new convert in the name of the Church.

Still more directly was confirmation perverted by the dangerous doctrine of baptismal regeneration. The baptized person was born again by virtue of the sacramental water. The Holy Ghost had been implanted at the font. That regeneration could not be supplemented by any later spiritual birth. Dr. Dix's "Trinity Church Catechism" declares that by baptism "we become God's adopted children and heirs of heaven; we are

cleansed from sin, and made temples of the Holy Ghost."

What further preparation for the reception of confirmation could be required? Certainly no *spiritual* qualification beyond this is possible. And so, the Prayer Book directed every minister, after baptizing a child, to warn the parents that they should "bring him to the bishop" to be confirmed by him, when he could repeat the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments and the Church Catechism!

Is it strange that such a theory of confirmation opened a wide door to unspiritualize the Church?

The Reformed Episcopalian struck at the tap-root of the weeds which choked this rite with errors, when he protested against the idea that baptism and regeneration are inseparably tied together. He does not require the confirmed person to "be brought to the bishop to be confirmed." It must be a voluntary act. He does not come in order to be made a Christian. He comes because through repentance and faith he *has been* pardoned, washed in the blood of Christ, and sanctified by the Holy Ghost.

The true soldier of his country is always such before he puts on the uniform. The national livery only makes all the world know what his heart is. Confirmation makes no man a soldier of the Cross, who was not such at heart before.

THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN AT THE LORD'S TABLE.

"*And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is My body. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.*" St. Matt. xxvi: 26-28.

No visible institution of Christianity, so impresses the mind and the imagination, as the supper of the Lord. Its hoary age makes it venerable. It antedates the Christian Church itself.

"Soldiers," cried Napoleon, to his army in Egypt, "behold the Pyramids! Forty centuries are looking down upon you."

Yet the passover, out of which the communion sprang, the passover which prefigured the sacrifice of Jesus, as the supper of the Lord recalls it to memory, belongs to the age when the Pyramids were built. The communicant is looked down upon by the witness of four thousand years. And when the Pyramids shall crumble, the Lord's sup-

per shall remain. For, "as oft as ye do eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death *until He come.*"

Little wonder if superstition has seized upon so venerable an ordinance, and used it as a potent weapon to subvert the freedom of God's children. It is the duty of every Reformed Episcopalian, as of every Christian, to know the exact nature of so conspicuous and solemn an institution of Christ. Let us attempt that duty to-day, with prayer for the Spirit's guidance.

I. What is the Scriptural and Evangelical view of the Holy Communion?

It would seem as if the New Testament had left us without excuse if we blunder as to the true answer to this inquiry. For doubt and controversy generally arise in regard to things concerning whose early origin history has left us in the dark.

The windowless "round towers" upon the rocky coast of Ireland, have given rise to whole volumes of controversial literature. Antiquarians and scholars have debated with each other whether they were places of religious worship, or fortresses for defence. But the discussion carried on for centuries, is not ended yet. For history contains no line or word to tell the story of their erection.

But the record of the institution of the Lord's supper has been given in the Bible so fully, so

clearly, and with such repetition, that error would seem impossible and debate unnecessary. We have four distinct and separate accounts, differing from each other in regard to no material fact. Three out of the four evangelists, viz., St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, have told the story nearly in the same words. It would seem as though these three accounts were sufficient. But when the apostle Paul finds the Church at Corinth perverting this sacrament from its holy purpose, he gives to that Christian community a fourth narrative of the first origin of the Lord's supper, which he declares he had received by direct inspiration from the Lord Himself. 1 Cor. xi : 23.

Now the first thing which attracts the attention of the Reformed Episcopalian who studies this fourfold record, is *the simplicity* of the Lord's supper.

Our foreign dispatches tell us that it is not an unlikely event, that the imperial crown of Germany may at any time be set upon the head of a child but five years old. How strangely out of place, upon such an infant—just as simple and childlike by nature as the little one in your home—will be the imperial robes, the glittering orders, the pompous splendors, and the artificial dignity which surrounds a monarch!

Equally unnatural, in the light of the New Testament accounts of the Lord's supper, seem to the

Protestant Christian, the pomp and ceremony with which the communion is sometimes celebrated. If the Lord Jesus had tried to choose a method of establishing an institution in his Church, which should be singularly plain, simple, and unencumbered by ritual, He could hardly have selected a different way. That simplicity appears in the *place* selected for the last supper. No splendid temple, no gorgeous sanctuary, no decorated shrine, witnessed the first eucharist. It was the bare upper chamber of some Jewish house borrowed for the occasion.

The same simplicity is revealed in the total *want of any ritual details.* Christ wrote out no rubrics of direction how the Church was to perpetuate this feast. The shelves of our ecclesiastical libraries are crowded with "manuals of devotion" for the use of communicants. They descend to minute directions as to postures, and even how the bread should be taken in the hand, and the chalice lifted to the lips. But Christ did not depart from the simplicity of the sweet yet solemn rite, by even an allusion to these minor matters. Christians have quarrelled whether their attitude around the Lord's table should be standing, as in the Greek Church; sitting, as is the practice of Presbyterians; or kneeling, as with Episcopalians. Yet no one of these postures is that of the apostles, for they reclined on couches, as the old Oriental fashion

was at feasts. "The simplicity which is in Christ," forbade attention to such details. The Reformed Episcopalian kneels, simply because the whole question of attitude is plainly a matter of indifference, in which every Church may exercise its choice.

Observe, too, how this simple and natural idea of the communion is preserved in *the symbols* employed. Jesus might have chosen sóme striking, unique, unprecedented emblems of His dying love. Instead of that, He takes the bread and the wine—both of which the Jews used in keeping the passover, and which were therefore right before Him. He seemed to say, "I make the simplest and most natural act of your daily life a blessed and sacred thing. I hallow with the remembrance of My love to you, even your partaking of food and drink." It was anticipating St. Paul's language: "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." When St. Paul rebukes the Corinthian Church for its failure to discern the real purpose of this sacrament, he says, "Wherefore brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another." How clear it makes it that the Lord's supper was a simple meal in memory of Christ. Not a word even to indicate that the presence of a minister was necessary to the due celebration of the rite!

The fourfold history of the institution of this

sacrament, leads the Reformed Episcopalian, in perfect accord with other evangelical believers, to regard the Lord's supper as a special *memorial* of Christ's atoning death.

In one of our public parks a statue stands, to keep in memory for all generations a great statesman whom it represents in marble. That commemoration is the one central idea with which it was erected. It doubtless serves other purposes as well. The great pleasure ground is ornamented by its presence. It bears witness to the liberality of the rich, and the self-denying patriotism of the poor. It forms a bond of union between the multitude of contributors to its erection. But these do not constitute the one great end which its erection had in view. If these subsidiary purposes be crowded to the front, and so kept before the public mind that the remembrance of the dead hero shall be lost sight of, better that the sculptor never touched chisel to the stone! A doctrine of the Lord's supper which belittles this memorial feature, has lost the primal end for which the communion was instituted.

Our Lord used *language* in His gift of this ordinance to His disciples, which can be only reasonably and consistently explained on the basis of its being primarily a memorial rite. He broke the bread, and gave it to them, with the words, "Take, eat, this is My body." Now, setting aside for the present,

the Roman Catholic theory of a miraculous change by which the bread was altered in its substance into the literal body of Christ, what could He have meant by words like these? Precisely what a father would mean, who, when about to cross the sea, gives his picture to his children, and says, "This is myself." He does not mean that the portrait is actually his own personal being, but that it *represents* it And the only value of such a representation is that it helps the memory to recall him. So, too, He speaks of the wine, "He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He said, This is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." The moment that you fall short of the Popish theory of a transubstantiation of the wine, you must of necessity understand Christ to mean that the wine was *a representation* of that blood which He was to shed for sinners. It was ever afterward to appeal to the *memory* of the believer.

Nor need we depend on a mere interpretation of His words in giving the emblems. St. Luke distinctly states that Jesus told the disciples what was the purpose of these symbols, and of the Christian's partaking of them. "This do," He said, "in remembrance of Me." Besides, when St. Paul received from Christ Himself the account which he gives in his first epistle to the Corinthian believers, he also declares that the very words of Christ were

those which St. Luke has recorded. And as if to make it clear that it was a ceremony to be perpetuated in the Church mainly as a memorial rite, St. Paul tells us that Jesus followed the giving of the cup with this still more explicit expression of His will, "This do ye, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me."

Observe, too, the *appropriateness* of the emblems to bring out in conspicuous relief, the memory of Christ's sacrifice. The bread of which they partook had been before that hour employed by Christ as a type of His body. St. John vi: 35–58. But now it is *broken*. Each account mentions with particularity this fact of the bread being thus treated in His hands. As if Christ would have the fact of His blessed body being bruised and pierced, the one prominent idea in the recollection of His people. In the City of Boston, thousands daily pass a statue of Abraham Lincoln. But it represents him in the act of taking the fetters from the limbs of a slave. It clearly seems to say that those who put that striking figure there, were not merely anxious to have posterity remember the great president, but remember him in that particular act of his eventful life. So do the broken bread and the flowing wine touch the memory of the Christian with the recollection of a Saviour in the act of giving His life for sinners.

Thus, the Reformed Episcopalian finds no

incomprehensible "mystery" in the communion as a means of grace. He does not approach the Lord's table with the feeling that it is some magic charm in which he is to find spiritual help, as the Romanist expects to find it in touching a relic of the saints, or the wood of "the true cross." Its philosophy is as clear as the noonday.

For what can rekindle in the heart the glow of love, like the stirring of the memory? In days of war, your voluntary substitute took your place in the ranks, and died upon the field of battle. Can you bring out from the place in which you treasure it, the memento which he sent you when he lay dying, and which is stained with his heart's blood, and yet feel no stirring of your soul's deepest love?

But the Reformed Episcopalian does not forget that together with this memorial idea of the communion, another great truth is coupled.

The Lord's supper is a visible Gospel. We cannot see these emblems of the death of Jesus without their preaching to us eloquently and powerfully the doctrine of His atonement. Why, then, do we not satisfy all that this sacrament demands, when we have looked upon the consecrated symbols of His dying love? Why eat the bread? Why drink the wine? Will not our love be wakened by the sight of this pictorial representation of His suffering for us? We have no hesitation in answering. Our bodily life is itself an emblem of our spiritual

life. Precisely as we sustain our bodily existence, by partaking of food and drink, so BY FAITH do we feed upon Christ. The Old Testament had foreshadowed it, when the prophet, turning from the rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic Law, cried from his watchtower of vision, "The just shall live by faith." Habak. ii: 4. Christ Himself echoed the same great truth, when long before the night in which he was betrayed, He solemnly declared, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you."

That He did not refer to the communion in these strongly figurative words, is plain. He uttered them at least a year before He instituted the Lord's supper. He spoke to an assemblage of Jews, who could by no possibility know anything of this ordinance to be established in the future. Moreover, when He discovered that they only saw in them a gross and earthly meaning, and wondered how they were to eat His flesh and drink His blood, He corrected their blunder. He told them that in His body He was to ascend to heaven, and that under the figure of His body and blood, He had spoken of His Spirit. "What and if ye shall behold the Son of man ascend up where He was before? It is the Spirit which quickeneth. The flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are life." "He that

believeth on Me hath everlasting life." John vi: 62, 63.

If any words could express more clearly than these, that simple trust in Christ and His word, sustains the spiritual life, as eating and drinking sustain the bodily life, it is difficult to imagine what those words could be. What follows? Evidently enough, that when the Saviour established the Lord's supper, He ordained this eating of the bread, this drinking of the wine, to be a symbol of the faith by which we must receive Him into our souls, and live spiritually upon Him.

It may be added that the Reformed Episcopalian sees one other great truth brought clearly before him in this symbolic rite. In thus entering into fellowship with his suffering Lord, he also becomes a member of the vast brotherhood, whatever be the name they bear, who partake of Christ by faith, "the blessed company of all faithful people." By trust in Christ, they "all eat the same spiritual meat, and drink the same spiritual drink." They symbolize and picture forth that loving fellowship by this visible gathering around the same table, and exhibit their common love and common interest in each other, by calling their memorial feast, "the communion."

No wonder that basing his view of the Lord's supper upon the teaching of the word of God alone, the Reformed Episcopalian opens wide his arms to

welcome to this sweet and precious feast, all who love his "Divine Lord in sincerity and truth."

II. What has the Reformed Episcopalian done to rescue the Lord's Supper from unscriptural perversion?

William of Orange, the leader of Protestant faith and civil liberty, against the Church of Rome and the tyranny of Spain, once placed his young son as a hostage in the hands of Philip II, the Spanish king. When at last restored to his father, the youth had been transformed. He had become a Spaniard in national spirit, a tyrant in political principle, and a bigoted Romanist in religion. Where lay the secret of so vast and complete a change? Simply here. The Spanish teachers *began early*. The Reformed Episcopalian who reads the history of the visible Church of Christ, discovers a like amazing transformation in the sacrament of the Lord's supper. He sees the simple, natural, logical truth that was embodied in a sacred meal, taken in common by believers, to commemorate the death of Christ, changed into an appalling mystery and gorgeous ceremonial. He sees the bread no longer broken, but in the form of a wafer. He sees the wine, in bold violation of the Saviour's last command, taken from the laity and reserved for the clergy alone. He sees the table which bore witness to the primitive principle of the communion as a solemn, commemorative feast, replaced by an

altar, on which a priest offers the consecrated elements as a sacrifice to God. He sees the wafer lifted up like an idol, and the people bowing in prostrate adoration as before God Himself. He sees the universal Church accepting for a thousand years the doctrine that the priest by his consecrating act has transmuted the bread and wine into the literal and actual body and blood of the Redeemer. How came to pass so amazing a revolution? The answer is that the enemy began early. There is no trace of such a ceremony or such a doctrine in the New Testament. We read of "the breaking of bread, and prayer" in apostolic history, and the epistles to the apostolic churches. We see the Christians gather at the simple meal which calls to their memory their suffering Lord. But that is all.

Yet, no sooner do we leave inspired teaching, and open the pages of the writers known as the "early fathers," than the perversion of the Lord's supper begins to appear. The good seed sown by the Son of Man was not yet grown, when the tares sprang up also.

No heresy of the Roman Church so directly led to the Reformation, as that of transubstantiation—the doctrine that what had been up to their consecration, bread and wine, became by miraculous change the actual flesh and blood of the Redeemer. Yet, so deeply rooted was this monstrous theory, that even Luther could not fully rid his own mind

of its remnants. Rejecting transubstantiation, he tried to reconcile his loyalty to God's word with what he called "consubstantiation"—the notion that while the bread and wine did not lose their nature, and were still bread and wine after consecration, yet in union with them was the body and blood of Christ.

But the reformers of the Church of England, on this point gave no uncertain sound. They may have entertained false theories in regard to baptism, but they did not find on that field the battle which they were to fight. The whole struggle of the English reformation raged about the supper of the Lord. And here they drew broad and unmistakable the Scripture line between Christ's truth and Rome's perversion. Let it ever be remembered that of the many hundreds who died amidst the flames of martyrdom, which Bloody Mary lighted, not one who did not give his life rather than accept a false doctrine *concerning the communion.* From Cranmer, the primate and archbishop, down to the humblest peasant and artisan, the English witnesses for Christ, were witnesses even unto death, against every form of perverting the simplicity of the Lord's supper. (Blakeney's Hist. Prayer Book, pp. 528, 529.)

It would be natural to conclude, that whatever error might find place in the Church of England and her daughter in America, it would be impos-

sible that they should wander from the truth concerning the communion. Here, surely, the principles for which Cranmer and Latimer, Ridley and Hooper died, will be guarded as men guard their homes and the lives of their children.

But the weed of a false doctrine of the eucharist is one which has tough roots, and readily sprouts again. From Reformation days there were those in the English Church who shrank from the strong, clear views of Cranmer, and his companions in martyrdom. They gained the ear of Elizabeth, eager to reconcile her Popish subjects to a Protestant liturgy. They led her to revise the communion service, so as to abolish a rubric denying the so-called "real presence." (Blakeney's Hist. Prayer Book, p. 449.) The same class of religious teachers still further corrupted the service when the prayer book was revised in the days of that worthless king, Charles II. (Proctor's Hist. Prayer Book, chap. v.) The germs of a doctrine which the reformers died at the stake rather than accept, were sown in the soil of the service. They sprang up here and there in the Church, but only reached their baleful harvest time when fifty years ago the Oxford Tracts appeared. From that hour no Canada thistles ever spread more rapidly. To-day, the doctrine of the "real presence" pervades our mother Church, and is taught directly or indirectly by the vast majority of her clergy. What

is that doctrine? Briefly, it is that while there is no change of substance in the bread and wine, Christ is spiritually present IN THEM after the consecration. Mark the language. Every Protestant believes with Archbishop Cranmer, that Christ is really present in the Lord's supper in the hearts of "all them that worthily receive the same." (Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner.) But the advocates of the notion of the real presence, mean such presence *in the bread and in the wine.* The officiating priest by consecration has imparted to the elements themselves the spiritual presence of Jesus Christ. Do not think that I exaggerate. Listen to this language from an accepted advocate of the doctrine: "The body and blood of Christ are sacramentally united to the bread and wine, so that Christ is truly given to the faithful." "His flesh, together with the bread; and His blood, together with the wine." (Tracts for the Times, N. Y. Edition, 1839, Vol. 1, p. 199.) "The nature of this mystery is such that when we receive the bread and wine, we also *together with them,* receive the body and blood of Christ." (*Ibid*, p. 214.) Dr. Pusey declares in his letter to the Bishop of Oxford, "There is a true, real and spiritual presence of Christ at the holy supper * * * * independently of our faith."

Dr. Pusey writes of the Lord's supper, "It is truly flesh and blood, and these received into us cause that we are in Christ, and Christ in us."

Dr. Dix's Trinity Church Catechism says, "The bread and wine become Christ's body and blood, yet remaining true bread and wine." (p. 51).

Dr. James DeKoven writes, "Believing in the presence of the body and blood of the Lord *in the consecrated elements*, I believe that presence to be in no sense material or corporal, but spiritual, though none the less real and true." (Letter to certain Wisconsin clergymen, 1874.)

In Pusey's "Eirenicon," a work written to prove how slight are the differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, he refers to "Palmer on the Church," as a book "framed word for word on our formularies, which received the sanction of two archbishops, and which used to be recommended to candidates for holy orders." From the work referred to he quotes these remarkable words: "She (the Church of England) believes that the eucharist is not the sign of an absent body, and that those who partake of it receive not merely the figure, or shadow, or sign of an absent body, but *the reality itself*. And as Christ's Divine and human natures are inseparably united, so she believes that we receive in the eucharist, not only the flesh and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself, both God and man." (Eirenicon, p. 31.)

Now, observe the exact idea which these quotations give. It is that the real presence of Christ in the holy communion, is not a presence in the

hearts of believers. It is "independent of their faith." But it is *in* the bread and in the wine. In one word, the Spirit of God is placed, through a man's consecration of the elements, in a piece of bread, and in a cup of wine! Is the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation any more degrading to the Spirit of God than this? Or is it strange that other perversions of the truth should have followed in its train?

If the consecrated bread and wine upon the Lord's table are really the body and blood of Christ, then it logically follows that the table ceases to be such. It has become an "altar," on which is offered anew the body and blood of Jesus as an oblation to the Father. "It is not," says Dr. Dix, "a sacrifice by way of a new death, but by way of a standing memorial of His death. It pleads to the Eternal Father, sets forth before the world, and applies to our souls the one sacrifice of Christ."

Then, too, as we shall see in a later sermon of this course, the minister becomes a sacrificing "priest," who offers, like the sons of Aaron, the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood. Hence it is that in the old Church, the word "minister" has come to be superseded by that of "priest." We no longer hear of a faithful parish minister, but a "parish priest." Yet we have only to turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews to learn that every trace of a sacrificing priesthood like that of Aaron passed

away when Jesus offered His "one sacrifice for sins forever," and "sat down at the right hand of God." Christ is the only priest of the Christian, except that every true believer, minister or layman, is one of "a royal priesthood."

But, above all, the whole system known as "ritualism," by which the public worship of the Church once so dear to us, has been completely disguised, is based on this false theory of the Lord's supper. The vestments which have superseded the simple robes worn formerly by ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church, are imitations of those which are supposed to have been worn by priests who offered sacrifices. A leader of the Church of England ritualists, in answer to the question, "What meaning do you attach to the vestments?" replied, "I take them to be a distinctive dress of a *priest* at the time of celebrating the holy communion." (Principles at Stake, p. 142.) In the earlier days of the Church out of which our own sprang, it was sometimes customary to bow the head at the name of Jesus in the Creed, to signify belief in His Divinity. To-day, a far more profound obeisance is made at multiplied points of the service, but—mark it well—*always toward the table.* Why? Because that table is now "the altar," with super-altar upon it, and crucifix crowning it. And if this theory of the "real presence," and a sacrifice in the Lord's supper, is true, they

are right who bow. For, if the awful presence of the Son of God is on that table, then, surely, I cannot prostrate myself in an adoration too profound. But if it be an unscriptural and idolatrous doctrine, then this bowing toward the so-called altar, is as offensive to God as prostration before a Chinese image or an African gree-gree.

Back to the word of God the Reformed Episcopalian has gone. Our Church has planted its feet upon the rock, in restoring the Lord's supper to its primitive simplicity. Open your Book of Common Prayer, and in its fore-front you find a "Declaration of Principles." In the name of the Reformed Episcopal Church, it condemns as "erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word," the theory "that a Christian minister is a priest in any other sense than that in which all believers are a royal priesthood; that the Lord's table is an altar on which the oblation of the body and blood of Christ is offered anew to the Father; and that the presence of Christ in the Lord's supper is a presence in the elements of bread and wine."

We framed our whole liturgy on the principles laid down in this declaration. From cover to cover, you will nowhere find a minister of the Gospel called a "priest." We blotted out the dangerous expression which styled the elements of bread and wine, "these holy mysteries." We saw in them no mysterious nature, but only simple and appro-

priate emblems. We went back to the reformers of the Church of England, and found that Cranmer and his fellow-martyrs had dropped out from the communion service, as it was first prepared, a Romish prayer, entitled the "oblation." The influence of the high church Bishop Seabury had prevailed to have it inserted in the American prayer book. We removed it once more, and restored the service for communion to the Protestant form in which the reformers had bequeathed it. We required that the minister in delivering the bread to the communicant, should call it "bread," and when delivering the cup should call it "wine"—that thus the Church should bear perpetual witness to the fact that no change had taken place in these emblems through the prayer of consecration.

We found that the Protestant Episcopal Church had omitted, under the same inspiration of Bishop Seabury, the rubric of the Church of England positively declaring that the consecration prayer does not change the nature of the elements, and that no worship of those elements is intended by kneeling at the communion. We put it back where Cranmer once had written it.

Then, to crown the work, we graved it upon the very constitution of this Church, that no altar should ever be permitted in any edifice in which Reformed Episcopalians should worship.

In an evil hour Archbishop Cranmer yielded to

the Bloody Mary's threats, and signed a paper recanting his own protest against the doctrine of the real presence in the bread and wine of the communion. Bitterly did he repent his cowardly act, and when the flames leaped up around him in the hour of his martyrdom, he thrust his right hand, which had written his recantation, into the hottest fire. "Unworthy hand! unworthy hand!" cried the penitent martyr.

Reformed Episcopalian, remember that for you to yield one hair's-breadth to the ritualism which has crept like a mildew over your old Church, is to do before God and angels and men, the very act of which Cranmer's "unworthy hand" was guilty.

THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN AND HIS MINISTER.

"*And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant; even as the Son of man came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.*" St. Matt. xx: 27, 28.

A child is born into this world as some shell or bit of sea-weed is tossed by the waves upon the shore. It lives by no choice of its own. But Jesus Christ always spoke of His birth as His "coming." It was His own voluntary act which laid the Babe of Bethlehem in the manger-cradle.

Like a leaf that flutters down upon the hurrying stream, the future of a child is shaped and controlled by currents and eddies, the drift of which baffles all human prophecy. No such contingencies affected the child over whose birth the angels sang their carols. He came into this world with a definite mission, which no power of man or devil could thwart. He was born only that this pre-arranged destiny might be carried out. "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world," said Christ, to the wondering Pilate.

When the twelve, fired by a low ambition for power, and jealous of each other, quarreled for

high rank in Christ's earthly kingdom, He rebuked them with the language of the text. He Himself had but one purpose from His birth at Bethlehem to the cross on Calvary. It was to be a *minister*, a servant of other men, for such is the exact meaning of the Greek word in which He described His office.

In this text the double work of Jesus is contained, like the twin seeds in their shell. He was to be a minister to men, and a ransom for men. That last feature of work He wrought out "once for all." No man can add to the completeness of that concerning which with His dying breath He cried, "It is finished."

But His ministry for men goes on. Through those whom He still sends, He ministers to the sinful and the lost.

I. The Reformed Episcopalian believes in, and honors a ministry authorized and appointed by Christ Himself.

Religious controversy has sometimes served to wrap the truth in fog-clouds of doubt. But the battle waged around the question of the ministry, has certainly had the opposite effect. Its fierce thunderstorms have cleared the theological atmosphere, and left some points so sharply defined that further discussion seems unnecessary.

Romanist and Protestant agree so far as this, that both confess that the word of God author-

izes the appointment of a class of men whose lives shall be wholly consecrated to the sacred ministry. There is substantial unanimity in acknowledging that our Lord Himself appointed men to such an office, in His choice of the twelve apostles, and in the sending forth the seventy disciples. Matt. ix: 5-8; Luke x: 1. Vast multitudes had become His nominal followers. But out of their ranks He selected these, as soldiers might be selected from the army to become officers and leaders in the campaign. The loftiest tree that ever towered toward heaven, and shadowed the earth with its spreading branches, had its birth in some tiny seed. So, the germ of the ministry of the Gospel is in this simple historic fact that Christ made selection from those who followed Him in His brief earthly work, of some to be leaders in proclaiming the kingdom of heaven.

The point to be kept in view is not whether all of Christ's people should not be in some sense preachers of the Gospel. It is not whether every layman is not bound to spread the glad tidings. But the root-principle which lies at the basis of this whole subject of the ministry, is in the record of the four Gospels, that the Saviour sent out a selected class of His disciples with a *special* commission in proclaiming the word. To this extent, it is clear that the ministry rests solidly upon Christ's own authority.

In the great plain of the Sacramento Valley, I have seen a rivulet take its rise among the foot-hills, grow to the proportions of a river, flow on with strong current for a time, and then strangely disappear, beyond the power of man to discover it. Such a failure is a strange anomaly in nature. It would be yet more strange in the spiritual world, if Christ, whose love to man, unsealed in apostolic days the flowing stream of the Gospel ministry, had in later times suffered it to perish from the earth. He promised that His presence with those whom He sent on this special work, should continue "to the end of the world." Matt. xxviii: 20. The work of the ministry was to be perpetuated till "all nations" had heard the Gospel. Matt. xxiv: 14; Mark xiii: 10; Rom. i: 5. The Reformed Episcopalian firmly believes that Christ has kept that pledge of His own word. He reads history, and sees "a darkness that may be felt" fall upon the world. Ignorance, superstition, false religion, and wide spread corruption perverted for a thousand years the "simplicity that is in Christ." But through it all, he sees that the true succession of the ministry of Jesus never failed. In monastery cells, in lonely Alpine valleys, in the courts of kings, and in the humble homes of the poor, Christ's Spirit prepared His ministers, whose light in darkest ages shone out like the stars. Thus, in full accord with the reformers of the Church of Eng-

land, the Reformed Episcopalian holds that the Spirit of God alone can make a minister of Christ. The Holy Ghost separates some men for this sacred office by an inward impulse through the teaching of the Bible, compelling them to cry out with the apostles, "Wo is me, if I preach not the Gospel." No other power, no other preparation, can create "an able minister of the New Testament." 2 Cor. iii: 6. The Reformed Episcopalian stands by the strong statement which the late Bishop William Bacon Stevens, of Pennsylvania, made in a published sermon, before his elevation to the episcopate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, "Education will supply the mind with knowledge; art will adorn it with its graces and beauty; oratory will make the tongue eloquent; personal accomplishments will make the man admired; the hands of a bishop may give him outward authority to minister the word and sacraments. But none of these, nor all combined, will make him a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ. This is the work of the Holy Ghost." (Sermon of Bishop Stevens, quoted by Rev. M. B. Smith, in his "Open Letter," June 6th, 1874.)

No wonder, surely, that with such authority lying behind the ministry, and giving it all its power, the Reformed Episcopalian holds in honor every true minister of the Lord Jesus. For us to despise or to neglect our ministers, to fail to hold up their

hands in prayer, encouragement, and material support, would be a far greater sin than it would be in a Church which holds that a mere outward ordinance can make a man a minister of Christ.

But it will be asked, "Does not the Reformed Episcopalian demand that his minister shall be set apart to his sacred office by a solemn ordination?" I answer that no Church on earth is more tenacious of such an orderly recognition of the Spirit's call to Christ's work.

The foreign-born American may have been full of the spirit of his adopted country before he was recognized by that country as a citizen. But the nation demands that be shall be naturalized in token of such recognition. The President of the United States was such in reality before he took the oath of inauguration. But good government requires that he be formally inducted into his high responsibility.

The Reformed Episcopalian holds earnestly that it is the duty of the Church, when satisfied by trial and examination, that God the Holy Ghost has moved a man to seek the ministry, to acknowledge that work of the Spirit by formal ordination.

But who shall ordain? If the New Testament had clearly settled that question, no choice could be allowed. If by that supreme authority, it be settled that bishops alone have such a duty entrusted to them, then we have no right to depart

from such a Scripture model. If, on the other hand, there be clear Scripture proof that only presbyters can exercise the prerogative of ordaining others, we sin when we commit such a duty to some higher officer of the Church. But if, with all the concentrated study of eighteen hundred years, no man, however learned, has been able to put his finger upon one passage of the New Testament, which fixes beyond all doubt just where the power to ordain resides in the Church, then it is perfectly evident that each Christian Church must decide that question for itself. In the light of the early history of the Church of Christ, the Reformed Episcopalian, with all other Episcopalians, is led to require a bishop to take part in every ordination. But Church history is one thing; the word of the living God is another. And, therefore, our Church recognizes the full validity of the ordination conferred by its sister Churches. We fully believe that Christian history justifies us in perpetuating episcopal ordination. We believe that in this way ours is what our Twenty-Fourth Article of Religion calls it—a "historic ministry." We honor it as continuing what has been handed down to us from the early ages of the Church. We honor it as a precious heritage from our fathers of the English Reformation. But until we can find in God's written word, a clear statement that ordination by bishops alone, is honored by the Holy

Ghost, we dare not brand with condemnation the orders of other Churches whose ministry God has blessed.

II. The Reformed Episcopal Church stands as a witness to bear testimony against two dangerous errors concerning the ministry.

The other day there came to you, flashed through the depths of ocean, a cable dispatch. It consisted of one solitary word. Received by any other than yourself, it would have had no deeper meaning than ordinarily attaches to that single name. But to you it was a cipher, and in its hidden significance it held concealed a message that it would take whole sentences to express.

The monosyllabic word, "priest," seems on its surface as innocent of all hidden meaning as any in our English tongue. For it is simply a contraction of the term "presbyter," the Greek form of "elder." It originally means, therefore, only an older man, such as might naturally be entitled by experience to be a teacher of his juniors.

So far as my knowledge of the various forms of Church government goes, I am not aware that any Church exists, in which there is not an office of "the elder," or "presbyter." And if we shorten the word into "priest," what danger is in the act? Simply this: that our translators of the New Testament selected the word "priest," as the name by which to render into English speech, a totally differ-

ent Greek word which invariably means a sacrificer—or one who offers an expiation for sin. It is never used in Scripture in any other sense. The sons of Aaron, like their father, were priests, because it was their distinctive work to offer on God's altar, bloody sacrifices, which pre-figured and typified the bloody sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. They stood as mediators between God and man. They offered sacrifice in atonement for a guilty people, who otherwise might not dare to approach God. They also presented the offerings of the people, which could only be accepted as they were given to God through these officiating priests. In one word, the Aaronic priesthood "stood between the living and the dead," mediating for guilty men before a holy God.

But when Christ cried from the altar of Calvary's cross, "It is finished," the Old Testament priesthood died as stars die in the heavens, when the sun arises in his strength. The typical priest was no more, because the real Priest had offered His "one, full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." The whole Epistle to the Hebrews is an argument expressly written to prove that the priesthood under the old dispensation had been done away by the sole expiation of the Lamb of God. "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin." But if no sacrifice, then no altar and no priest. "There is one

Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus."

The New Testament indeed calls all true believers "a royal priesthood," and "an holy priesthood." But why? Because they are members of Christ Himself, "bone of His bone, flesh of His flesh." As being "in Christ" we can "enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus." But, O, do not fail to remember it! Not one solitary passage of the New Testament ever styles a minister a "priest" on account of his ministerial office. For a minister to arrogate that title to himself, is to revolt against the plainest teaching in the word of God.

It may be added that the earliest of the uninspired writers known as "the fathers," betray in their writings no trace of this perilous doctrine. (See Lightfoot on The Christian Ministry, pp. 247–253.) Not until the third century did early Christianity become corrupted by the notion that a minister is a priest.

But the dark ages came. The Roman Church rivetted its fetters on a superstitious people. What bond could hold the conscience in such slavery as this—to make the lay member of the Church look on his minister as a "priest," who alone could offer a sacrifice for sin, or present an oblation to God upon His altar. The Council of Trent put that dogma into its decrees, and chained the Church to the conquering car of a priestly

caste. Against that doctrine the Reformation was the protest of living Christianity. But in the Church of England, "the eldest daughter of the Reformation," this priestly idea has been revived. I have elsewhere alluded to the change which has passed over our mother Church in the name by which its ministers are called. Some of us "old-fashioned Episcopalians" recall a time when the word "priest" was rarely used in reference to a minister of Jesus. To-day, every rector of a parish is spoken of as "the priest in charge." But what does this change mean? Let the answer come from the lips and pens of those who thus use the word. The Rev. Mr. Mackonochie, of St. Alban's, in London, says, "The priest gives to every communicant the heavenly food of the Divine sacrifice." (Principles at Stake, p. 141.) Dr. Pusey, Archdeacon Denison, and twenty one clergymen of the Church of England, addressing the Archbishop of Canterbury, say, "The same body once sacrificed for us, and that same blood once for all shed for us, sacramentally present, are pleaded by the *priest*." (*Ibid*, p. 141.) The Rev. Mr. Bennett, on his examination, was asked:

"Do you consider yourself a sacrificing priest?"

"Yes."

"In fact, a *sacerdos*, a sacrificing priest?"

"Distinctly so."

"Then you think you offer a propitiatory sacrifice?"

"*Yes; I think I do offer a propitiatory sacrifice.*" (*Ibid*, p. 142.)

We cross the sea. We enter Old Trinity Church, in New York City. Its rector wields the vast influence of the wealthiest religious corporation in our country. His whole Church endorses his soundness by his election to preside over its last General Convention in this city. Let us hear him teach the children from the "Trinity Church Catechism:"

"When we celebrate the holy eucharist on earth, with what do we join ourselves?"

"With the offering of Christ in heaven."

"How so?"

"Christ in heaven, is doing in glory, what the priest on earth is doing in a holy mystery." (Trin. Ch. Cat., p. 50.)

Such is the teaching which in our mother Church lies hidden in this seemingly harmless word, "priest." Against it, our beloved Reformed Episcopal Church is a perpetual witness. She has no sacrificing priest but Jesus. She dares not allow her prayer book to apply to a preacher of the word, and pastor of the flock, a name which would rob Jesus of His glory in offering His sole sacrifice.

Closely connected with this error is that which teaches that our Lord not only appointed a ministry, but also its *precise form and order*. We are

told that as an architect furnishes a builder with a detailed pattern containing minute specifications of the building to be constructed, so did our Lord give to the apostles the specifications after which the Church was to be moulded for all coming time. "Wheatley on the Book of Common Prayer," a standard work in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and a text-book in its theological seminaries, distinctly asserts, "What Aaron, and his sons, and the Levites, were in the temple, such are the bishops, presbyters, and deacons in the Christian Church." (Wheatley, p. 97.) "These were appointed by God, as those were, and therefore it can be no less sacrilege to usurp their office." (*Ibid.*) Again, "None but those who are ordained by such as we now call bishops, can have any authority to minister in the Christian Church. (*Ibid.*)

Dr. Dix's Trinity Church Catechism puts this theory in even stronger terms. It states that during the "forty days" between the resurrection and the ascension, Christ gave to the apostles, as the first bishops of the Church, "a definite constitution, government and officers." It declares that Christ has never permitted but "one kind of government for His Church," and that, "episcopal government." To belong to a religious body not having this episcopal goverment, "is disobeying Christ." No man can be "a lawful minister" who has not been "ordained by a bishop." The "Prot-

estant sects" are not Churches at all, but have "cut themselves off from the Catholic Church, by abandoning the Catholic ministry." (Pp. 76–79, 87 and 88.) Such is to-day the generally accepted view held concerning the ministry in the Protestant Episcopal Church. In the past, the low church party resisted it bravely. But the McIlvaines and Meades, the Tyngs and Anthons, have passed away. The feeble relic of the once powerful evangelical element may here and there faintly remonstrate; but it is like the pressure of a child's finger against the onward march of a glacier.

Nothing but a separate organization, having all the episcopal characteristics that the old Church could claim, yet standing on the strong foundation of the Bible, could successfully bear witness against such an error.

When the Reformed Episcopal Church was founded, its Twenty-Fourth Article, which you will find in your prayer book, and which I ask you carefully to read, declared such a view of the ministry "unscriptural and productive of great mischief." It graved deep on its constitution, the ecclesiastical equality of presbyters, "whether episcopally or otherwise ordained."

Its canons not only allow interchange of pulpits with other evangelical ministers, but provide for their reception into its ministry without re-ordination.

Are we justified in such a protest as this Church makes against the two errors—that Christian ministers are sacrificing "priests," and that the threefold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons, is clearly necessary to the being of the Church?

The *consequences* of those errors justified us. For they excluded from the Church of Christ, millions of the noblest witnesses for Jesus that ever lived in holiness, and died in triumphant faith. They made their ordination to be an unmeaning farce, their sacraments to be utterly invalid, and their whole work, by which, to a very large degree, our own land has been evangelized, to be a rebellion against God. Out of the priestly and exclusive theory of the ministry sprang also the notion of auricular confession and absolution by a priest. For when a bishop laid his hands upon a candidate for the sacred office, the prayer book authorized him to say, "Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." The abomination of auricular confession in a Protestant Church, is boldly commanded in the catechism already quoted. (Pp. 66, 33–35.) The question is asked, "By whom is God pleased to forgive sins in the Church?" And the answer runs, "By the priests of the Church."

Such is the logical result of such a view of the ministry.

Our protest is justified by the *English reformers*. No fact of English history is more undeniable than that the martyred founders of the English Church recognized the ministry of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, Germany, Holland and Switzerland.

Archbishop Cranmer was aided by Knox, Melancthon, Bullinger, Calvin, Bucer, and Martyr —all ministers of non-Episcopal churches, in the preparation of the prayer book. (*Vide* Dr. C. M. Butler's "Old Truths and New Errors," p. 116.) Not only so, but for a hundred years, under the bishops of the Reformation period, Englishmen who had received only Presbyterian ordination,* held parishes, and ministered without question in the English Church. (*Ibid*, p. 123; Keble's Preface to Hooker, p. 38; Blakeney on the Prayer Book, chap. vii; Bishop Short's History of Church of England, sections 314 and 324; Goode on Orders, pp. 45–47; Bishop White's "The Case of the Episcopal Churches in America Considered," p. 21.) The writings of the men who died at the stake under the Marian persecution, are full of the clearest acknowledgement that episcopal ordination is not necessary to a valid ministry. (Blakeney, p. 630–632.)

But, above all, our protest is justified by *Scrip-*

* Vide Appendix, C.

ture. Even the ordination services of the Protestant Episcopal Church make no claim that the Bible alone proves any fixed and definite constitution of the ministry. They only assert that Scripture and the "ancient authors" show that the three orders existed from the days of the apostles. No microscopic search reveals authority for the statement quoted from the Trinity Church Catechism, that Christ, in the forty days between His resurrection and His ascension, gave to His Church a "fixed constitution" for all time, in the threefold orders of "bishop, priest and deacon."

And from one end of the New Testament to the other, the word "priest" is never applied to a Christian minister. St. Paul calls himself an apostle, a preacher, a witness to Christ, but never a priest. St. John styles himself an "elder," 2 John 1, but nowhere a priest. St. Peter writes, "The elders (or presbyters) which are among you, I exhort, who am also an elder." But St. Peter would as soon have denied his Lord again, as to have written, "Who am also a priest."

Christ came to be our eternal Priest and Sacrifice in one. But He "humbled Himself" to minister unto men. May God save His Church from a human ministry which would rob the Lord Jesus of His supreme and solitary Priesthood.

THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN AND HIS BISHOP.

"*This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good thing,*"
1 Tim. iii: 1.

At the present day, according to the latest statistics, there are about four hundred and twenty-five millions of nominal Christians in the world. Out of these, in rough numbers, something like three hundred and twenty millions are Episcopalians. (McClintock & Strong's Cyc.)

Let us freely admit that in the sphere of religion, majorities are never a test of truth. No spiritually minded Christian will claim that the value of any religious principle depends on the approval or disapproval of the larger number of mankind.

But, at the same time, we may not forget that so remarkable a phenomenon demands some adequate explanation.

If three out of every four Americans held a certain view of the question of the protective tariff, or of civil service reform, it would not of necessity prove that opinion to be truth. But it would prove that it was entitled to a most respectful consideration. In exactly that attitude does the Epis-

copal polity in church government appeal to Christian minds.

But what *is* Episcopacy? There are some names whose real meaning you only discover when you deal with them as the devotee of science deals with the stones known as "geodes." They must, as it were, be broken open, to find what lies hidden inside. Such a word is the Greek "episcopos," which in the English Bible is translated "bishop." It has in it just this significance—it means an "overseer."

Clearly then, an Episcopal Church is one which believes that certain ministers hold a position of oversight in church affairs. There may be very different notions as to the authority which these overseers possess. There may be widely variant views as to the source from which their authority is derived. But the essential principle of Episcopal government, which lies underneath all its forms, consists in this gift to certain ministers of an oversight of the Church of Christ. Bearing this definition in mind, let us ask ourselves:

I. Does the Reformed Episcopalian believe that the office of a bishop is of Divine appointment, and perpetuated by an unbroken Apostolic Succession?

A family portrait gallery often reveals some peculiar feature descending from generation to generation. Our Church was born of the Protes-

tant Episcopal Church. And if we inherited from our mother extravagant views of the office of a bishop, it would only be an illustration of the laws of heredity.

For not more clearly do high church writers assert that Christ established the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, than they insist that He appointed the three-fold order of bishops, priests, and deacons. (Marshall on Episcopacy, pp. 61 and 62. Chapin on the Primitive Church, pp. 168–171. Tracts for the Times, No. 2, p. 10. Bishop Doane's Missionary Bishop, p. 22). But the Reformed Episcopalian protests against such a position as contrary alike to the Scripture, to history, and to all the analogies of human life.

A village springs up on the virgin prairie of the West. A mere hamlet as yet, its government is of the simplest character. Two or three men are vested with all authority that so primitive a state of things demands. But population grows. The hamlet becomes a town. The necessities of the case call forth a demand for a new class of officers. By and by, a city, numbering its tens and hundreds of thousands, has swallowed up in its vast population the little germ out of which it sprang. New emergencies arise, and the government which was adequate for a country town, is succeeded by the complete municipal machinery of a great and populous city.

But those who founded the place did not provide the offices of city magistrates, aldermen, mayor, and judges of various courts, while the hamlet consisted of a half a dozen houses and a half a hundred people. Those offices were created when the need for them arose. It is the natural and historical way.

Exactly parallel to this is the account of the natural development of the Apostolic Church. The early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles reveal to us no ministers, no administrators, no governors of the new born Church, except the Twelve Apostles.

But as the Gospel spreads, and multitudes are added, the emergency calls for a new set of officers, and the *deacons* for the first time appear. The lowest office in the ministry is the earliest to be created. But it arose only when needed, and grew out of an unforeseen emergency. (Lightfoot on Christian Ministry, p. 185–189.)

But all this time the entire Christian Church had been confined to a single city. Jerusalem alone had contained the whole of Christ's "little flock." Now persecution drives them out. Scattered throughout Palestine, they carry the great tidings with them. New churches spring up far distant from the apostolic centre. The Twelve can not be pastors in a hundred different towns. And so another new emergency calls forth the appoint-

ment of "elders" or "presbyters." It is not till the eleventh chapter of the Acts, and probably ten years after the appointment of the seven deacons, that elders or presbyters are mentioned. They came like the deacons, to supply a felt want. They were appointed only when such a want arose. But from the beginning to the end of the Acts of the Apostles you look in vain for any record of the creation of the Episcopate.

The name "bishop" is not in the book of the Acts, except as St. Paul calls the presbyters of Ephesus "overseers," where the Greek word is equivalent to "bishops." Wherever the name is used throughout the epistles, it refers to presbyters. Every advocate even of the highest claims for divine authority for the office of the bishop, frankly confesses that "bishops" and "presbyters" are used everywhere in the New Testament to signify the same office. Bishop Henry U. Onderdonk, in his tract on "Episcopacy Tested by Scripture," distinctly says, "The name 'bishop' which now designates the highest grade in the ministry, is not appropriated to that office in the Scripture. The name is given to the middle office, or presbyters, and all that we read in the New Testament concerning 'bishops,' is to be regarded as pertaining to that middle grade. It was after the apostolic age that the name 'bishop' was taken from the second order, and appropriated to the

first" (p. 12). With Bishop Onderdonk agree all the writers of distinction of the Anglican Church, as well as every other church, from Hooker (Eccles. Polity Book VIII, V. 1) down. Surely nothing then can be clearer than this fact, that a bishop and a presbyter in the view of the New Testament are one. If when no apostles remained alive to exercise oversight in the Church, some presbyters were chosen to hold a supervisory position, and to them the name of "bishop" was given to distinguish them from their fellows, it was to meet a felt need in the Church precisely as with the deacons and presbyters. But nothing can be more certain than the fact that no Divine command exists for the appointment of such an order in the ministry.

Even if we admit the claim that Timothy was made a bishop at Ephesus, and Titus at Crete, by the authority of the apostle Paul, it would not follow that it bound the Church everywhere, and in all ages to maintain such an office as a permanent feature of the ministry. For the apostles sanctioned the community of goods among Christians; yet no believer in modern times regards that principle as obligatory on the Church or its members, Acts ii; 42–45.

Apostles sanctioned anointing the sick with oil, Jas. v: 14. But no man regards it as a Divine command for all lands and ages.

St. Paul recognizes an order of "deaconesses,"

and commends a Christian woman to the Church at Rome, expressly calling her by that name, Rom. xvi : 1. Yet the order of deaconesses has almost died out from the Church, and no Christian imagines that a Divine obligation requires the Church to restore it. Episcopacy may be a form of church polity equally suited to all times and regions. We Reformed Episcopalians would be last to deny it. But that because after the apostles died, Episcopacy is found prevailing throughout universal Christendom, it is therefore a polity which God requires as essential to the existence of His Church, we abhorrently deny.

But it will be asked, does not the Church of England, and through her, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, claim an "Apostolical Succession" of bishops, so that in an unbroken chain from the apostles down to the latest prelate consecrated, each one can trace his ecclesiastical pedigree? Unquestionably such a claim is made, and on the basis of it, we are told that outside of this genealogical line there can be no valid transmission of ecclesiastical authority.

How monstrous such a doctrine is, can be more fully realized when we remember that it makes invalid and a mockery all the work which since the Reformation, God has wrought by the non-Episcopal Churches. On this theory they are no churches. Says Dr. Chapin (Primitive Church,

p. 93), writing in regard to this Apostolical Succession, "The existence of the Church is inseparable from it." At the same time that this theory remands all non-Episcopal Churches to the category of unauthorized "sects," it makes the corrupt and idolatrous Roman Church to be a true Church of Christ, because the chain of "Apostolic Succession" has been preserved in the consecration of its bishops

Yet no line or word of the Scripture can be adduced to prove that either Christ or His apostles commanded any such galvanic chain to be constructed, through which the unseen current of church life should flow. There is no record in the Acts or the Epistles of a solitary consecration of a bishop. The chain drops powerless because its very first link is wanting. However far down the centuries the so-called succession may have been extended, there is no proof that it ever had a beginning.

But we are told that the early fathers of the Church and writers of its history, give us every link of this chain. In Chapin's "Primitive Church," the list is seen, page after page, from St. Peter and St. James, down to the last chosen bishop of the Anglican Church in the United States. But these lists are based upon statements derived from fragmentary writings of men, most of whom lived in the third and fourth centuries of the Christian era. Chapin himself is forced to confess that "it

was not customary in the Primitive Church to record the names of the consecrators of the bishops" (p. 276). How utterly untrustworthy such lists are, is seen in the fact that the different catalogues contradict each other.

One list makes Clement the first bishop of Rome. Another as positively confers that dignity upon Linus. Still a third leaves Clement out, and remands Linus to the second place in the succession. (See Mossman's History of the Early Church, p. 1–5. McClintock & Strong's Cyclop. Art. "Pope.") No wonder that Bishop Stillingfleet writes (Irenicum, Part II, Chap. 6) "The succession of Rome is as muddy as the Tiber" And yet we are gravely told that the "existence" of God's Church on earth "depends" upon this contradictory testimony.

As we follow this frail thread down the ages, it becomes still more confused and tangled. There were long dark ages in which all history becomes a hopeless labyrinth. Yet the believer in Apostolic Succession must hold that all Church existence depends on a certainty that through that period of ignorance and corruption, when bishops were feudal chiefs and warriors armed *cap a-pie* for battle, and when their lives were the shame of mankind, each one was duly consecrated, and the long chain never broken.

Added to this, we have the positive testimony of

Jerome in the fourth century, and of a host of later writers, that the great metropolitan Church of Alexandria (whose line of bishops figures largely in these lists) during two hundred years immediately succeeding the apostles, always chose its own bishop from among the presbyters, who laid *their* hands upon him in consecration. (Gallagher's "Prim. Eirenicon")

The Reformers of the Church of England, who sealed with their blood their testimony to the truth, unanimously reject such a theory of Apostolical Succession. Cranmer argued that a presbyter and a bishop were of the same order, and that no consecration to the Episcopate was necessary. Bishop Jewel distinctly states that the Scripture makes a bishop and presbyter the same, and "only church custom" elevates the former above the latter. Even Archbishop Whitgift, opposing Puritan attacks upon Episcopal order, owns that "the Church of Christ may exist *with or without this or that form of government.*" (See Dr. C. M. Butler's Old Truths and New Errors, pp 113–118.)

What the reformers and martyrs of the English Church thus forcibly and boldly taught, was also the earnest conviction of the first bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, The venerable William White, Bishop of Pennsylvania, has been well styled "the father of Episcopacy in America." When the English bishops,

after the Revolutionary War, hesitated to consecrate a bishop for the revolted colonies, Dr. White recommended that bishops should be appointed and *consecrated by presbyters*. ("Case of the Episcopal Churches in America Considered.") So stands the case. Against this theory of Apostolic Succession, the protest rings out from good men of every age, from all Christian history, and from the Word of God.

II. WHY DOES THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN THEN, RETAIN THE OFFICE OF A BISHOP?

What is useless is a hindrance. No army on a forced march carries unnecessary burdens. There is no evil against which public opinion cries out more vehemently than the multiplication of needless offices. Why then have we bishops? Our answer is that we sincerely believed in the *practical value* of having in the Church such a presiding officer.

Not long ago I stood at the entrance of a military camp, appealing for admittance. But whether or not I had a right to enter, was not determined by the whole regiment. Neither did the entire staff of officers bear that responsibility. It rested with *one officer* to settle whether the glittering bayonet of the sentry should be lowered, and I admitted. Such a rule was inconvenient for those who sought admission. It doubtless provoked remonstrance. But its practical wisdom no rea-

sonable man could doubt. For a divided responsibility for any important duty, is always perilous to safety. To hold one individual responsible, is the fruit of ripe experience.

The Church of Christ has ever taught that the entrance to its ministry cannot be too carefully and jealously guarded.

The Reformed Episcopalian holds that in no way can the worthless and the ignorant, the unsound in doctrine and the unholy in living, be so effectually barred from entering the sacred ministry, as by holding one officer of the Church responsible for ordination to the work of Gospel preaching. Responsibility is like the precious metals. One grain of gold may be beaten so thin as to cover a surface of fifty square inches. But its thinness destroys its tenacity and strength. It is an awful responsibility to which a church holds one of its officers, when it demands that he shall answer for the entrance gate of ordination. It cannot fail to impress him with a sense of his need of God's grace and wisdom sought in prayer. The Reformed Episcopalian does not believe that such responsibility will waken so profound a sense of watchfulness and prayer when it is beaten out to cover fifty or a dozen men with the duty of ordaining.

Let us pass from the entrance of the ministry into the *government* of the Church itself.

No bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church can ever be "a lord over God's heritage." But as an adviser and a friend, he stands among his fellow ministers a presiding officer. If heart-burnings and jealousies creep into the hearts of fallen men, who, though ministers of Christ, are liable to temptation, it is his to "reprove, rebuke and exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine."

He occupies too, the responsible position of a mediator and arbitrator, when differences spring up between ministers and their congregations. Troubles which might grow to vast dimensions and a shameful publicity, and add to the scandals that block the progress of Christianity, if either left to themselves or entrusted to the settlement of councils or ecclesiastical courts, may be quieted and harmonized by the wisdom and godly counsel of a presiding officer of the whole Church.

Moreover, who can so stir up the stronger parishes "to support the weak," who can to the same degree interest one church in another, and push on the missionary effort of the whole body, as an officer whose sympathies, interests, and responsibilities are enlisted not in a single congregation, but in the Church as a whole?

The force of this argument for the practical worth of the Episcopate, is strengthened when we look around us at our sister churches.

The man who loses an arm, is apt to supply

the deficiency by an artificial substitute. To a certain degree it does the work of the lost limb; but it also proves how necessary that limb was. Does it not also prove that a presiding officer among his fellow presbyters, is a necessity to the Church, when we find in the non-Episcopal Churches, a bishop—not in name—but in actual work and responsibility? In almost every city of our country, some one Presbyterian clergyman is a bishop in the sense in which the Reformed Episcopal Church retains that office, except that he is not the sole ordainer. I feel sure that our Congregational brethren would cheerfully admit that their growth in the West has been largely due to a supervision —an Episcopal oversight—of all the scattered congregations—exercised by certain secretaries of Home Mission work, who are bishops in every sense save the authority to ordain.

It clearly shows that such an office is a natural and necessary one. It grows out of the inevitable demand of all human society that for every body there should be a head. Are we Reformed Episcopalians wrong, when we claim that having the office, we should give the officer his ancient name?

We have been charged with inconsistency in one prominent fact of our history. The Reformed Episcopal Church rejects, as we have seen, the theory of an unbroken succession of Episcopal consecrations from the apostles down. "Why

then," it has been asked, "did it come into existence only when a bishop of the old line led the movement? Why does it continue, to consecrate bishops by bishops, and thus perpetuate a succession to which it attaches no importance?"

The answer is, that Reformed Episcopalians *do* attach importance to their historic Episcopate. We do not hold that it is necessary to the existence of a valid ministry and a true church. But we believe that it links us with the glorious Reformers of the English Church. Their polity is ours. It puts us clearly in that ecclesiastical family which preserves the idea of a president among presbyters, which history testifies was the practice of the early Church.

But that is not all. Our argument of practical utility again has its influence. The work of this Church must always be largely in the line of opening a refuge for Episcopalians. It must be a home for men who love a liturgy and Episcopal government, though loving the Gospel better. And to such it is able to say, "Whatever you had in your mother Church, of historic value, you have here also. If your old Church claimed to give you an Episcopate historic beyond all question, so do we." When Bishop Cummins entered on the work of this Church, he wrote to the Presiding Bishop of the communion from which he withdrew, that he took the step in order to "transfer his work *and*

office to another sphere." He entered this Church bringing his Episcopal office with him. As such he consecrated other bishops.

It has been urged that canon law requires three bishops to consecrate. But history is full of instances in which but one acted as the consecrator. (Chapin's "Primitive Church," p. 284.) Dr. Pusey himself writes, "Consecration by one bishop is valid." (Letter to Bishop Gregg, Dec. 4th, 1876.) Cannon Liddon, as high authority as the highest churchman could desire, has distinctly admitted over his own signature, when his opinion of the historic position of our Episcopate was sought, "A consecration by one bishop is valid. All orders conferred by a bishop so consecrated are undoubtedly valid." (Letter to Bishop Gregg, Nov. 17th, 1876.)

Dean Stanley, certainly one of the profoundest students of Ecclesiastical History that the English Church has produced, has also pronounced his verdict as follows: "Whoever lays hands on presbyter or deacon (whether bishops or presbyters) takes part in the consecration or ordination: though *a single bishop is sufficient* in each case." (Letter to Bishop Gregg, Oct. 18th, 1877)

We can therefore give to our brethren who desire a pure Gospel in a historic church, an invitation which could not have been extended, if ours were not a church in the line of the historical Episcopate.

But our Church has a reason over and above its practical argument for Episcopal polity. Antiquity considered by itself, proves nothing to the Christian. There are ancient institutions which degrade man and dishonor God. Polygamy and slavery are gray with age.

But when we cherish something which itself is good, and possesses a manifest practical value, it adds to that value, to know that it has stood the test of ages. There are certain principles of right and justice which constitute the bulwarks of society in this nineteenth century. But it certainly adds to the estimate in which we hold them, when we find them in the Magna Charta, and know that they have stood between freedom and despotism since the barons at Runnimede wrested them from the reluctant hand of King John.

We have seen that Episcopacy has a practical value in our own day. Surely, it ought to add to the honor in which we hold it, if history shows that it has come down to us from the apostolic age.

If too, we find that the New Testament hints at, if it does not clearly prove, the fact that overseers were appointed while the apostles lived, to do precisely the work which bishops do in an Episcopal Church of our own time; and if later history shows that through all the earlier centuries of Christianity that polity prevailed, we have a valid reason for retaining the Episcopal office.

That such evidence is to be found in the New Testament appears indisputable to the Reformed Episcopalian. All Protestants admit that the Twelve Apostles ordained other ministers, and that upon them there fell "the care of all the churches."

Now the simple question is, did these Episcopal duties of ordination, and supervision of the churches cease to be exercised by presiding presbyters when the apostolic band gradually passed away from earth? Even before the death of the last apostle, did there exist no such presidency among the presbyters of the early Church when the work became too extensive for the personal supervision of the Twelve? Let the reply come from St. Paul's own writings. He says to Timothy: "The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also," 2 Tim. ii: 2.

And when we ask how, and in what form, the authority to preach was to be conferred by Timothy, we receive the answer from the same authority. He tells Timothy to "lay hands suddenly on no man." He was to use the same watchful care and thorough examination of a candidate, expected of a bishop now; but when such investigation was complete, he was to admit the man who had thus been scrutinized by "*laying on of hands*," 1 Tim. v: 22.

Still stronger does the point of our argument appear in the directions given to Titus, "For this cause," says St. Paul, "left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I have appointed thee."

These two presbyters of the early Church manifestly exercised a power which did not belong to other presbyters. St. Paul exhorts Timothy to forbid the preaching of certain doctrines, 1 Tim. i: 3, which can only be explained on the theory that he had supervision of his fellow ministers. Explicit directions are given him as to the qualifications on which he should insist in those exercising their ministry under him, 1 Tim. iii. He is to count a presbyter who ruled well, "worthy of double honor." He is not to receive an accusation against a presbyter, except in the presence of two witnesses, 1 Tim. v: 17 and 19. When satisfied of sin on the part of a presbyter, he is to rebuke him publicly, 1 Tim. v: 20. Titus is given instructions to "rebuke with all authority." If necessary, he was "to stop the mouths" of those who taught for the sake of filthy lucre. He was vested with judicial power to reject those who held and taught heresies in doctrine, Titus i: 11; ii: 15; iii: 10. It seems almost impossible to avoid the conclusion that these two early ministers of Christ were entrusted by apostolic hands with

precisely the duties and responsibilities which now pertain to the office of a bishop.

Let us make no mistake. Let us create no misunderstanding. The New Testament does not say that Timothy and Titus were apostles. It does not assert that they, or either of them, ever succeeded the apostles in their peculiar office. But it does make it reasonably evident that even in the apostles' days, some presbyters were appointed to oversight of the Church. They were entrusted with special authority in the two departments of admitting men to the ministry, and exercising a leadership and presiding influence. How perfectly natural it would be that as martyrdom, or a more peaceful death took the apostles from their earthly work, the model suggested by their appointment of Timothy and Titus, and perhaps others, as presiding presbyters, should lead the Church to make such an office a permanent feature of its polity. (Vide Lightfoot on the Ministry, p. 194–197) And what was so natural, actually took place. As early as the period A. D. 107–116, Ignatius testifies that the Episcopal polity was universal in the Church. (Marshall on Episcopacy, pp. 109–113) (Litton on the Church, p. 301.)

It is unnecessary to cite the long category of Christian writers whose testimony makes it clear that from the time of Ignatius, onward for 1500 years, bishops presided over all the ever spreading activities of the Christian Church. We may justly

reject many of the opinions of these writers. We may treat their doctrinal views precisely as we do those of any other uninspired men. The Bible is the supreme test to which they must be subjected even as the preaching and writing of teachers in the nineteenth century. But their religious opinions are one thing. Their historic testimony is another. They are competent witnesses as to what took place in their own age. And their evidence is absolutely like that of one man. Beyond all question they prove that the universal polity of the Church from within a hundred years of the death of Christ onward, was an Episcopal polity.

What makes this the more remarkable, is the fact that while endless controversies arose regarding Christian doctrine and government, there is no record of any question concerning the settled polity of the Church being a government by bishops. Orthodox and heretics on that point were perfectly agreed.

The Reformed Episcopalian cannot believe that within thirty years of the death of the last apostle, the universal government and polity of the Church could have become Episcopal, if such a system had been repugnant to the apostles' own teaching and practice. May God help our beloved Church to prove by its history yet to be, that Episcopacy and broad charity may be yoked together, and the love of Christ made known by a church, which preserves the office of a bishop! Amen.

THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN AND HIS PRAYER BOOK.

"*And it came to pass, as He was praying in a certain place, when He ceased, one of His disciples said unto Him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples,*" St. Luke xi: 1.

Among the external peculiarities of our Church, none attracts more attention than the fact that we worship with a liturgy, or precomposed form of devotion. Precisely as some singularity of feature or expression of the face, is more quickly noticed than a more important and vital singularity of inward character, so does our Prayer Book worship more readily arrest attention than our doctrinal principles.

For three hundred years a controversy has agitated the Protestant Churches, regarding set forms of prayer. But ancient as the discussion is, it has not died of old age. It is a living question to-day. Like many other debated points, it has not always been discussed with a large-minded fairness or Christian temper. I earnestly trust that moderation and sincerity may be the features of our consideration of it.

I. WHY DOES THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN EMPLOY A PRAYER BOOK IN PUBLIC WORSHIP?

In my boyhood, when commerce was conducted by the aid of a currency more varied than the leaves upon the trees, every counting-house was provided with a "counterfeit detector." It settled every question. To its standard every suspected bank note was referred. We have a far more infallible "detector" of what is false in religion. The rock on which the Protestant builds, is the Word of God alone. To that supreme test we must submit. Hence if a liturgy employed in public worship, is clearly inconsistent with the Bible, the sooner we reject precomposed prayer, the better.

It must be a hasty glance which we give at the past history of God's people, but it certainly will shed some light upon the vexed question of liturgical worship. When God had delivered Israel at the Red Sea, the rescued people engaged in a solemn act of worship, Exodus xv. Moses and the men of Israel sang a chant of thanksgiving. But Miriam and the women take up the burden of the same words, and sing them responsively. It is difficult to see how such worship could have been conducted without some prearranged form.

Again, in the 6th chapter of the book of Numbers, God speaks to Moses and gives him this direction: "Speak to Aaron and his sons, saying, On this wise shall ye bless the children of Israel, saying unto them," and then follows a long and

elaborate benediction, of which every word is pre-composed and prescribed.

In the 10th chapter of the same book, Moses is described as using a set form of words whenever the Ark of God led forth the people, and whenever it rested on their march.

Five hundred years later, we find David using a form of worship when the Ark, after long captivity is brought to Jerusalem, Ps. lxviii : cxxxii.

When Solomon offered his solemn prayer at the dedication of the Temple, he uses the very language prepared and written by his father David in the preceding generation. (Comp. 2 Chron vi : 41 with Ps. cxxxiii.)

But why go back to a period so remote? Let our text bear its witness. Twice over did Jesus give to his disciples what we call the "Lord's Prayer," It was in response to their appeal, "Teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples."

No one believes that the Jews who composed the following of Christ, were strangers to the act of prayer. They clearly meant to say that John the Baptist had taught *his* disciples some form of supplication adapted to their needs under his preparatory stage of the Kingdom of God. And now Christ's followers ask for a form of prayer that shall be an advance upon John's—a distinctively Christian prayer. And with that request the Sa-

viour complied. He not only said, "After this manner therefore pray ye," Matt. vi: 9, but also as St. Luke records, "When ye pray, *say* "—thus distinctly giving them a liturgical form, Luke xi: 2. Surely we need no stronger evidence that a form is not necessarily out of harmony with either the Old or the New Testament.

But another reason impels the Reformed Episcopalian. A responsive form of worship is a continual *protest against a ministerial and priestly monopolizing of the public service of God.* It is an easy way to rid one's self of all business cares, to "sign a power of attorney," by which a man divests himself of his own personal rights, and transfers his individuality to another.

That act, in the sphere of religion, constitutes the Roman Catholic idea. The rights, responsibilities and duties of the laymen are transferred to the priest. All religious worship centres in the celebration of the mass. It is not needful that any beside the priest should be present. The people have in it no necessary share.

When the Reformation came, its leaders were quick to see that one of the most effective means to secure to the laity a recognized place in the Church, was a responsive liturgy. Luther prepared forms of worship for Germany. The Swedish Reformers followed his example. The Moravians possess and use to-day a service book, dating

back to 1632 Calvin was among the earliest to perceive the importance of a book of common prayer, and himself gave a liturgy to the churches of Switzerland. Even the Presbyterians of Scotland, in Reformation days, did not wholly depart from the principle of a pre-arranged mode of public worship. (McClintock & Strong's Cyclop., Art. "Liturgy.")

In England a Scriptural Prayer Book was felt to be the first essential step toward giving the layman his Christian rights. Cranmer and his fellow-workers called to their aid the great lights of the Reformation in other lands, and with their help laid in the English Church the deep foundations of liturgical worship. But in every case the underlying principle, and the impelling motive were the same. It was the conviction that nothing can guard the rights of the Christian layman against priestly encroachment, like a form of worship in which the people have their necessary share.

Moreover, a liturgy possesses a singular *teaching power*. One can always discover a man's doctrinal views from his prayers. Precomposed or extemporaneous, a prayer is like the coin bearing the image and superscription of the mint in which it was stamped. Consequently prayer must be a powerful doctrinal preacher. The public worship in a congregation is continually teaching either falsehood or truth. But extempore prayers, of necessity change

with every alteration in the belief of him who leads the worship.

The manifest advantage of a precomposed form is that it steadily and persistently teaches the same truth. Out of an old-fashioned iron-studded door, it is possible to draw the nails. But only by reducing the door itself to a heap of chips. So with a liturgy. Only by its destruction can you separate from it the truth it contains. Were I to become a Unitarian, and deny from this pulpit the essential Divinity of Christ, the liturgy with its supreme exaltation of the Saviour, with its threefold ascriptions to the persons of the Trinity, would steadily give the lie to every sermon I could preach.

There can be no more striking witness to this principle, than is furnished by the present condition of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Forty years ago the vast majority of the laity, a goodly proportion of the clergy, and nearly one half of the House of Bishops, were avowedly evangelical low churchmen. To day the old evangelical party is like the race of mound-builders of our Western plains. It is hopelessly extinct. Why? Because the Prayer Book was a more powerful teacher than the evangelical pulpit. Baptismal regeneration, priestly absolution, a sacrifice in the Lord's supper, and an exclusive church system, were interwoven with the fibre of the services. They persistently contra-

dicted the low churchman in his pulpit. I bless God that the Reformed Episcopalian has a Prayer Book which is a consistent teacher of evangelical truth. I may be false to the Gospel. So may every other minister of this Church. But so long as this Prayer Book is used for our worship—so long will the desk overcome the pulpit in its teaching power.

Such are some of the reasons why the Reformed Episcopal Church is a liturgical Church. They are reasons which are not only satisfactory to us, but are profoundly influencing other Christian Churches. Within the past three years the thinking Christians of our own country have been stirred by an able discussion on this subject in one of the great literary magazines. (Vide *The Century Magazine*, 1885, '86, '87.) That debate, participated in by the leading minds of all the churches, was initiated by a distinguished Presbyterian clergyman, who advocated liturgical worship as the best method of uniting the scattered forces of Protestant Christianity. Right or wrong in his conclusions, he certainly has brought the fact to light, that in the minds of evangelical believers there is a growing conviction in the direction of a precomposed form of public worship. The Reformed Episcopalian can desire for his own Church and liturgy nothing better than such an agitation of Christian thought.

II. What is the Prayer Book of the Reformed Episcopal Church?

The impression has been created that ours is a new liturgy, sprung upon the world like a fresh invention in mechanics. If such were the case, it would justly prejudice the Christian mind against it. For a prayer book is not like the tree which Japanese jugglers make to spring up and grow to full stature in an hour. It must be the product of the ages. There is a reverence in the prayerful disciple of Christ, which leads him to feel that if he is to worship in the use of forms of prayer, they must be those in which the penitence and praise, the hope and faith of ages past have found expression. Precisely such is the Prayer Book of the Reformed Episcopalian.

It may surprise some who hear me to-day, to be told that in almost every instance in which we have departed from the liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, we have gone back to the second Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth, the work of the martyrs of the English Reformation. Ours is therefore a more ancient form of prayer than that with which we formerly worshipped. Moreover, those parts of our service in which our liturgy agrees with that of our mother Church, have been handed down from the earliest ages of Christianity.

There is nothing in uninspired language that stirs

my soul like the old hymn called the "Te Deum," "We praise Thee, O God, we acknowledge Thee to be the Lord!" It bears me back upon its sublime praise to the days when Christians, driven from the surface of the earth, met for worship in rock-hewn catacombs. Nor can I forget, as an American, that this was the first Christian song heard on the soil of this Continent, when Columbus fell upon his knees, and the Te Deum praised God for a new Western world.

But at the very latest, the Te Deum was used as early as the sixth century. (Wheatley, p. 150. Procter's Hist. of P. B., p. 223.) The Gloria in Excelsis, the opening words of which were sung by the angelic choirs when Christ was born, has voiced the praise of believers for at least twelve hundred years. (Palmer, Origines Liturg. II, 158; Procter, p. 361; Wheatley, p. 335.) The Apostles' Creed has been the outline of Christian doctrine accepted and repeated in worship, from the fourth century. (Procter, p. 229; Wheatley, p. 155.) Nor is what we call the Nicene Creed of much later date. Originating in the year 325, and put in its present form half a century later, since the year 381, its clear and trumpet-like tones have proclaimed the Divinity of the Saviour. (Procter, p. 229.)

Still more ancient are the Versicles, "The Lord

be with you;" "And with thy spirit." (Wheatley, p. 160; Procter, p. 240.)

The great majority of all the brief prayers which we call "collects," have breathed the pleadings of believers into the ear of God for more than twelve centuries. (Wheatley, p. 212; Procter, p. 271.) Surely, such a heritage, consecrated and hallowed by the devotion of Christian ages, and fragrant with the memories of saints in glory, is a possession which no true believer will despise.

But it will be said that the Protestant Episcopal Church claims all this sanction of the centuries for *its* liturgy, and that we changed what was handed down to us by the Reformers of the English Church. Is it true?

Through three hundred years of growth in art, no painter has been vain enough to try his pencil in attempting to improve Raphael's matchless picture of the Transfiguration. If like that masterpiece, the liturgy of the old Church came down to us precisely as the Reformers bequeathed it, then his would indeed be a bold hand which should venture on its revision. But exactly the opposite is the truth. The Prayer Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church has known no less than *seven* revisions. Five of these were made in England, and two in the United States of America. Some of these revisions were in the interest of Protestant and Scriptural truth, some sought to assimi-

late its worship to that of the Church of Rome. But the fact stands attested by the unerring witness of history, that our fathers both in England and America, have no less than seven times deliberately revised the Book of Common Prayer. Like some old cathedral, it has seen in each period of the past, some dilapidated portion taken down, and new additions made.

It is ignorance of this indubitable fact of history, which has made many Episcopalians feel that to revise the Prayer Book were a sacrilege like revising the Word of God. They have been led to imagine that as the old Ephesians supposed that their silver statue of Diana dropped down from Jupiter out of the skies, so this silvery liturgy had dropped down from the sacred hands of the Reformers.

When Henry VIII for wholly worldly reasons broke away from the Papal power, no attempt had been made to have throughout the English Church a uniform public service. There were different forms or "uses," as they were called, in different dioceses of England. But with Henry's death, his son, Edward VI, mounted the throne. It was like the young Josiah succeeding to the crown of his idolatrous father. Then came what may be called the first revision of the Prayer Book. It was the work of men educated in the Roman Church, and just opening their

blind eyes for the first time to the light. They saw "men as trees walking." No wonder that the liturgy they produced was full of the false teachings in which its compilers had been trained. No wonder that this *first* Prayer Book of Edward VI taught that the Lord's supper was a sacrifice, the holy table an altar. No wonder that it permitted auricular confession and prayers for the dead.

Cranmer and his associates were all this time studying the Bible. Slowly but surely they came into the full light of the Gospel. Three years after the first Prayer Book of Edward VI, was published, they could not conscientiously use it, and in 1552 the *second* Prayer Book of Edward VI, appeared. Strange as it may seem—that liturgy, given to the Church of England, three hundred and thirty-six years ago, when the Christian world was just emerging from its long night of Papal darkness, was the most truly Protestant service book that the English Church has ever possessed. Its baptismal service, it is true, taught a grievous error. But aside from that, it was almost wholly Scriptural and evangelical. It rejected superstitious ceremonies. It cast out the doctrine of "the real presence" in the bread and wine. It expunged the word "altar" as applied to the Lord's table. It did away with auricular confession. And to the communion service it added the very rubric which you will find substantially in

your Reformed Episcopal Prayer Book (but *not* in that of the Protestant Episcopal Church) explaining that when we *kneel* at the communion, we mean no act of adoration of the elements of bread and wine. (Blakeney, p. 34. Procter, pp. 37–39.)

Time forbids that I should more than mention the later alterations of the Prayer Book in the English Church. In 1559, Queen Elizabeth sought to reconcile her Popish subjects by a new revision. It was then that the rubric to which I have just referred was stricken out. (Blakeney, p. 51; Procter, pp. 59 and 60.) The sun of reform moved backward in the ecclesiastical sky. Every change made was in the direction of conformity to the Church of Rome.

Twice was the English Prayer Book revised under the monarchs of the House of Stuart. But in each case, the changes made it less and less the Protestant liturgy which Edward VI had bequeathed. Under Charles II, the most godless and morally corrupt king that ever disgraced the English crown, no less than *six hundred changes* were made in the services. (Procter, p. 137.) But Archbishop Laud was the Primate of the Church of England. A Romanist in everything except the name, he gave a Romeward impulse to the work of revision, and the Prayer Book of 1662 became thenceforward the liturgy of the English Church,

(Procter, Chap. V.) (Fisher on the Prayer Book, Chap. IV.)

Now observe what this hurried historic glance reveals. It demolishes the absurd notion that there is no precedent for revising the Book of Common Prayer. What our English forefathers did not hesitate repeatedly to do, we have a right to undertake. But it also shows the reason why the Church of England was always "a house divided against itself." The ancient creeds and prayers, the Scriptural anthems and versicles, and indeed the whole framework of the liturgy, were teaching evangelical truth and making low churchmen of multitudes who faithfully used it in worship. On the other hand, the Church catechism, the baptismal, the communion and the ordination services were mixing subtle poison in the children's bread, and steadily creating a drift toward the Church of Rome.

A century passed away, and the American colonies became a free nation. Episcopalians were scattered throughout the land, without bishops and without a Prayer Book adapted to the altered circumstances in which they were placed. In the year 1785, a convention of clergy and laity met in the City of Philadelphia, to take measures for the organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. Its president was the venerable William White, afterwards bishop

of that Church in Pennsylvania. Among its lay delegates were such men as John Jay, James Duane, Francis Hopkinson, and Charles Pinckney —men whose genius and patriotism made the Revolutionary period of our national history an era of surpassing splendor. That convention appointed a committee to revise the English Prayer Book. The result of their work was "the Prayer Book of 1785."

In all its distinguishing features it went back to the old Reformation work of 1552—the second and Protestant Prayer Book of King Edward VI. It left out all assertion of necessary regeneration in baptism, all suggestion of "real presence" in the bread and wine of the Lord's supper; it expunged the word "priest," and substituted "minister." In one word, it was a Protestant and evangelical liturgy from cover to cover.

Adopted by the convention, the new Prayer Book was read in worship at the closing session by Dr. White. Let us see what followed.

Dr. William White, of Pennsylvania, and Dr. Samuel Provoost, of New York, were subsequently chosen bishops, and on the 7th of February, 1787, were consecrated to their office by the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth in England. *That consecration was on the basis of the Prayer Book as revised by the convention of* 1785. (See Appendix)* That Prayer Book of Bishop

* Appendix, D.

White, is in all essential features the one adopted by our Reformed Episcopal Church, and with which we worship to-day.

But before 1785, Dr. Samuel Seabury, of Connecticut—an extreme ritualist and high churchman, had failed of securing for himself Episcopal consecration from the English Church. Its bishops had grave doubts whether he had ever been duly chosen to the office. (Internat. Review, July, 1881, pp. 319–322.) Then Dr. Seabury appealed to the Scottish Episcopal Church to aid him. By that extreme semi-Romish communion, his secret election, in which no layman had any part, was accepted, and he was consecrated at Aberdeen nearly three years before the consecration of Bishops White and Provoost.

But Dr. Seabury's consecration was given by the Scottish Episcopal Church with a purpose in view. It was followed by his solemn pledge that he would introduce into the American liturgy, the idea of a priestly sacrifice in the Lord's supper. (See Bp. Seabury's "Concordat," in Blakeney's Hist. of the Prayer Book, pp. 159–161.) That pledge he fulfilled to the letter. He persuaded Bishop White to give a reluctant assent to uniting the Church in Connecticut with the newly formed Protestant Episcopal Church.

Bishop Provoost to the last was opposed to Bishop Seabury's admission. But in 1789, when

the Prayer Book of 1785 had hardly come into general use, the influence of Bishop Seabury succeeded in overthrowing the work of the first Convention of the American Episcopal Church.

The Prayer Book on the basis of which the English bishops had consecrated Bishops White and Provoost, was rejected. A new liturgy, permeated by the sacramental and ritualistic teachings of Bishop Seabury and his Scottish consecrators, was adopted. This last is the Prayer Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church to-day.

The Prayer Book of the Reformed Episcopalian is the old and original liturgy, adopted by the first Convention of the American Episcopal Church, and on the ground of which its first bishops were consecrated.

III. How should the Reformed Episcopalian to use his Prayer Book?

It is needless to say that he ought to use it *intelligently*. The best of tools may be worthless, and even dangerous, in the hands of the ignorant. The Prayer Book needs to be understood in order to be a genuine help to devotion. To such an understanding, its history which we have studied in this sermon, is essential.

But the Reformed Episcopalian needs to be an intelligent student of his liturgy because sincere Christians are sometimes intensely *prejudiced* against it. The believer who worships with a

liturgy should be able in all Christian charity to defend it. He will find that many earnest but ignorant Christians believe a Prayer Book to be Popish. He will be told, "You worship with a book; so does the Romanist."

The answer is, that it is no argument against what is good in religion, that a corrupt church employs it. On the same ground we might reject the Atonement and the Trinity. Does any man refuse quinine when malaria has laid hold upon his physical strength, because the tree which furnishes the drug, grows in the most malarious land on earth?

Nor is it true that the Roman Church has anything corresponding to our "common prayer." Her priests and her people have different service books. But any one book which requires concurrent worship on the part of the clergy and the laity, is something unknown to the Papal Church. (McClintock & Strong's Cyclop., Art. "Liturgy.")

We shall also find that the prejudice exists, that a liturgy inevitably produces *formalism*. We are told that a Prayer Book makes the worshipper a mere parrot-like employer of phrases to which he attaches no meaning. But the argument is childish. You may pour melted lead into a mould, or let it flow freely out upon the ground. But it will grow hard in the one case as in the other. If a man loses his hold on Christ, and ceases to seek sin-

cerely for the influences of the Holy Spirit, there will be coldness and spiritual hardening, deadness and formality, whether he pray extemporaneously or with a liturgy. For many years, though myself an Episcopalian, I listened every Sunday to the preaching, and joined in the public prayers of a distinguished Congregational pastor. Yet with each sentence of "the long prayer," I knew what the next was to be, precisely as I do in the petitions of the litany. It was a form of prayer after all. Yet I am very sure that sainted man was not "a formalist."

Can any good reason be given against precomposed prayers, which does not equally apply to precomposed hymns of praise? Well did old John Newton write,

> "Crito freely will rehearse
> Forms of prayer and praise in verse;
> Why should Crito then suppose
> Forms are sinful when in prose?
> Must my form be deemed a crime,
> Merely from the want of rhyme?"

Still again, prejudice charges that in the litany especially, we indulge in what Christ forbade as "*vain repetitions*."

But the intelligent worshipper with a Prayer Book cannot forget that the Psalms of David, composed and used for public worship, are marked by precisely such repetitions. Nor did our Lord rebuke repetition in prayer, but "vain" or *empty*

repetition. On that awful night of His agony in the garden, three times did He pray that the cup might pass from Him, "saying," St. Matthew expressly records, "*the same words.*" We need not fear formalism when following in his blessed steps. An intelligent use of his Prayer Book will prevent formalism in public worship, because no Reformed Episcopalian can study his liturgy, without perceiving that it is not a tyrant to hold him in bondage, but a *teacher* to instruct him. He cannot open his Prayer Book without confronting the "Declaration of Principles," announcing that this Church retains a liturgy, "*which shall not be imperative, or repressive of freedom in prayer.*" He turns a few pages, and finds an extract from the Canons, ordered by the General Council to be printed in every edition of the Prayer Book, which provides "that nothing in this Canon is to be understood as precluding *extempore prayer* before or after sermons, or on emergent occasions."

After the General Thanksgiving in the morning prayer, the Reformed Episcopalian reads a rubric distinctly allowing extemporaneous supplication to be substituted for what are called "the occasional prayers," *i. e.*, those for the sick, the afflicted, or those in peril by sea or land. And if this shall lead him to a broader investigation of the spirit and practice of his Church, he will find that its Gen-

eral Council has directed the encouragement of laymen to engage in meetings for social prayer, and that such meetings are universal in the parishes which compose our entire communion.

But the Reformed Episcopalian should use his prayer book not only intelligently, but *spiritually*. Who is the man that is stirred in soul, uplifted into a new world, quickened in every faculty, as he gazes on a masterpiece of art, or listens to burning eloquence, or is swept along the tide of delicious song? Only the man who deliberately yields himself up to it, and loses himself and all around him, in it.

So it is in worship, whether extemporaneous or precomposed. We must give ourselves sincerely to it. We bow our heads in silent prayer when we enter the sanctuary. Doubtless we ask that such absorption in worship shall be our experience. But how do we carry it out? I fear that too often we grieve the Spirit by making no honest effort to lose ourselves in the service. Some are in the habit of leaving the worship to their neighbors. Others respond indeed to the psalter, but take no part in the litany, nor have a hearty voice for the "Amen" at the close of every prayer.

From the beginning to the end of the service, the Prayer Book should never leave your hands, except in the Scripture reading. When you close it in anthem or in prayer, you lead yourself into

temptation to wandering thoughts, and set an evil example to those around you.

Nor only so; but our very postures have their relation to our spiritual enjoyment and blessing in the worship. The reason why people do not kneel in prayer is because they are not praying. If they realized that they were actually pouring their hearts' needs into the ear of God, they could not help assuming the natural attitude of prayer. And the posture would in its turn react in helping to make their devotion a living reality. To lounge indolently while God's praise is sung, has but one meaning, when age or infirmity do not excuse it. It means that there is no praise in your heart. Even though you have no musical power, with your open Prayer Book in your hand, you can follow the glowing anthem or the sublime Te Deum.

Remember also that your children can be trained to public worship in a liturgical service, as they cannot be where all except the singing of hymns is extemporaneous. They have a right to the teaching power of the service. Its "line upon line, and precept upon precept," can be inwoven with the earliest dawnings of childish intelligence. But only as parents lead their children to the house of worship, and guide them in the use of the liturgy by their aid and their example.

Dr. Albert Barnes, an earnest opponent of liturgical worship, once wrote that when Episcopalians

took part in prayer meetings, "their prayers are models of simple, pure and holy worship." (Barnes' Position of the Evangl. Party in the Episcopal Church, p. 37.)

No wonder. From childhood they had been imbued with the spirit of a worship which filled the souls, and lingered on the lips of martyrs for Jesus. They had caught the refrain of the anthem which echoed in dimly-lighted catacombs, "in dens and caves of the earth."

"Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ!

"Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father!"

THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN AND THE CHURCH YEAR.

"*For Paul determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend his time in Asia; for he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the Day of Pentecost,*" Acts xx: 16.

"*Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years; I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain,*" Galat. iv: 10, 11.

Our two texts present two seemingly contradictory portraits of the Apostle Paul.

The variations between two photographs of the same person, may often be explained by a change of dress, a different attitude, or a fleeting expression of some inner feeling sweeping across the countenance like a cloud across the sky.

It is not so easy to account for the startling divergence between these two pictures of the same religious teacher. At the first glance they appear to contradict each other. On the river Tigris, the Arab boatmen pray with their faces to the East. But so crooked is the stream, that in order to keep the eastward position, they are constantly shifting their attitude from one direction to another. Shall we conclude that the

current of St. Paul's life was so tortuous that he was ever changing his attitude in reference to great and momentous questions?

Look for a moment at these two contrasted pictures. The first represents the apostle on his way from the continent of Europe to Jerusalem. Ephesus, with its Christian Church, lay just on the path his ship would follow. To the elders and the people of that community of saints, he was attached by ties only to be compared with those binding the parent to the child. Yet he "determined to sail *by* Ephesus" In the Greek it reads "*past* Ephesus." Why? Did they not need his fatherly counsel? Would there be no comfort to his own soul in "beholding their order and the steadfastness of their faith in Christ?"

These were not the causes which lay behind his resolve. The reason is plainly given. He was determined to be at Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost. Nor was this merely the fixing of a date at which he had set his heart on reaching the Holy City. For, on a previous occasion, he hurried away from the entreaties of his friends with the explanation, "I must by all means keep this feast which cometh in Jerusalem," Acts xviii: 21.

It was a strange reason for St. Paul to give. The feasts and ordinances of the Mosaic law had been abrogated in Christ. Had He not "blotted out the handwriting of ordinances" which was

against us, "nailing it to His cross?" Yet apparently St. Paul was so eager to observe this dead ordinance of the Jewish law and ritual, that he sails past the faithful flock of Ephesus in his haste to keep Pentecost at Jerusalem.

Now look at the contrasted picture. Portraits often differ because taken at different periods of life. But unless all our chronology is at fault, the date of the Epistle to the Galatians varies but a year or two from that of this voyage past Ephesus and its Christian Church. (Vide Conybeare & Howson, Farrar's Life of St. Paul.)

That epistle is full of sad reproofs of the believers in Galatia. They were apparently making the Gospel of Jesus secondary to the observance of Jewish forms and ordinances. Not least dangerous in its perversion of the truth was the fact that they insisted upon the Mosaic feasts and fasts as a necessary part of Christian obedience. "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years." So strongly does St. Paul feel the peril of this error, that he adds, "I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain."

How strangely inconsistent does this reproof appear, when put side by side with the apostle's intense eagerness not to miss the celebration of Pentecost at Jerusalem!

Yet one simple thought, which runs all through the New Testament, is like the stroke of a master,

bringing these two discordant views of the apostle into perfect harmony. That thought is this: The Christian may often accept as a *privilege*, that which he allows no man to impose on him as a *bondage*.

No British subject shall outdo me in profound honor to the noble woman who wears the crown of England. It is my right and privilege thus to reverence the exaltation of a pure womanhood. But if any sought to impose such reverence upon me as the ground of my citizenship, and the condition of my rights as a free man, it would stir in my veins blood which flows from the far-off fountain of revolutionary ancestors. Like St. Paul, "I was free born."

Precisely here lay the point of divergence between St. Paul and the Galatian Church. The apostle could find spiritual blessing in keeping certain seasons which his Jewish fathers had observed. But the Galatians sought to make them the basis of Christian character. Just as they imposed circumcision on Gentile converts as necessary to salvation through Christ, so they doubtless imposed a regard for Jewish days and months and years, as an essential of Christian character. It was against such perversion of the believer's liberty, that St. Paul entered his ringing protest.

The Reformed Episcopalian draws precisely this

line of distinction between the use and abuse of what he calls "the Christian Year."

No Puritan shall revolt more indignantly than he against imposing any seasons or times upon the Christian Church or the Christian member of the Church. Yet he may find in those seasons, helps to growth in grace, which he counts among his sweetest Gospel privileges. Let us then inquire, WHAT IS THE CHRISTIAN YEAR, WHICH THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN OBSERVES?

A systematic order is something which generally lies beneath the surface. A glance at an arching elm or gnarled oak, reveals to me the grace and grandeur of the tree. But it takes investigation to discover the perfect system by which the roots gather nutriment, and the minute veins bear the vital sap through trunk, and branch, and twig, out to the remotest leaf that quivers in the breeze.

In war time, a new recruit is enlisted in the army. In the first glow of his enthusiastic patriotism, the one idea which lays hold upon his mind, is that he is to fight the battles of his country. But it takes but little time to learn that a soldier's life is to be governed by a plan which assigns to every day and every hour its own peculiar duty.

Not unlike this, is the discovery which gradually comes to him who enters on the work of a Christian soldier in a liturgical and Episcopal Church.

Educated perhaps in some other Christian

Church, he only recognizes at first, the fact that Episcopalians, in their public worship, employ certain precomposed forms of prayer and praise, contained in the Book of Common Prayer.

But, by and by, it dawns upon him that underneath this fact there is a system, an order and a plan, which gradually reveal themselves. He cannot follow the worship of the Prayer Book, without perceiving that it takes a year, and dividing it into certain seasons, engraves upon each of these, the commemoration of some one great Christian doctrine or some event in the life of the Saviour. All history is witness to the value of such a system as a mode of education. We may cut deep in marble or bronze the inscription by which we would perpetuate some fact or principle or honored name. But "the tooth of time" is relentless. All material monuments crumble. All inscriptions upon them fade. But the seasons return with unfailing certainty. That which is engraved upon a day, a week or a month, will reappear as surely as time's revolution does its work.

The Reformed Episcopalian who follows the leadings of his Book of Common Prayer, will find directly succeeding the communion service, a series of "collects, epistles, and gospels, for use throughout a year." The collect is simply a brief prayer; the epistle is an extract from one of the letters which by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, were

written to the early Christians, and the gospel is a selection from one of the four histories of our Saviour's life on earth. But the three—the collect, gospel and epistle, are like the harmonious chords of a perfect instrument of music. They blend in teaching the same truth. Some one special fact or doctrine breathes through all three alike.

But when you turn to these services for the Christian Year, you discover—perhaps to your surprise (if educated in some other church), that its first day bears no relation to what we commonly call the New Year season. We begin not with January, but with a Sunday falling in December, or possibly even in November. For ours is not the secular year, not the year of the astronomer, not the year of the man of business. It is the *Christian Year.*

The First Sunday in Advent is our New Year's Day. The services are evidently meant to take us back, as it were, to the days when men were looking for the coming of the Son of God. We stand where such Israelites as Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, and Simeon, and Anna stood, and watch and wait for the angel's song to announce that Christ is born. Three Sundays more make up the Advent Season. But through them all "one unchanging purpose runs."

It makes every faithful member of our Church, like one who looks out to sea, expecting the ship

which bears homeward his long absent friend. It leads us to realize God's infinite love in sending His own Son to live with men and to die for men. Above all, it will not let us forget that He has given His word that He will come again.

Our Master foretold that even His own people should "slumber and sleep," and become forgetful of this cardinal fact of His Second Advent. But the Episcopalian who allows this truth to slip from his grasp, does so in defiance of his Church, which annually sets the services of the first four Sundays of the Christian Year, like watchmen to cry in drowsy ears—"The Lord is at hand."

Then comes the birthday of our Lord. Our appointed worship for Christmas Day is full of gladness. But it is a gladness like that which Isaiah foretold, "when a holy solemnity is kept." Wherever there are hearts to glow with joy, and tongues to sing in praise, the fixing of this one day concentrates every thought upon the love that led the Son of God to humble Himself to be born of woman.

A little further on, and we reach the season bearing the Greek name—"the Epiphany." It means literally "the shining forth." It suggests to our minds a light shut in and obstructed by opaque walls, suddenly bursting through all that dims its glory, and flinging its rays far out upon the night. The stranger to our services is told that by the Epiphany season we recall the visit of the "Magi"

—" the wise men from the East "—to the newborn King of the Jews. Perhaps the appointment not only of a chosen day, but of several Sundays which follow, to commemorate an event briefly recorded in the New Testament, demands explanation. But in the Epiphany lies the title deed of the Christian who is not of Israel's race, to his share in Christ's salvation. The Old Testament never let the subject drop, of the coming Epiphany when Gentiles should know the salvation which began with the Jewish race. Every prophet foretold that glorious day. Over and over did Jesus Himself in both parable and direct statement teach His disciples—" Other sheep I have which are not of this fold." And the star-led Magi from the distant East were the first of that mighty multitude of Gentile birth to claim what God had promised. The Sundays of the Epiphany season are not out of proportion to the magnitude and importance of the event they fasten in the memory.

Nor only so ; but Epiphany is ever like a hand that points us to work undone, like a voice that reminds us of duty. If we forget that there are millions yet of Gentiles on the earth—heathen who never heard of Christ—this season of the Christian Year ever urges us to missionary work and liberality and prayer.

Passing from Epiphany, we are reminded by our services of the approach of Lent, and of the

Easter glory which appears beyond it. Three Sundays intervene between the season of Epiphany and that of Lent. They bear the old Latin names of Septuagesima—the seventieth, Sexagesima—the sixtieth, and Quinquagesima—the fiftieth. Not accurately, but only in round numbers, they suggest to the mind that we have reached in our journey to the resurrection of our Lord, the seventieth, the sixtieth, the fiftieth day before Easter.

If you study the collect, epistle and gospel for each of those days, you will find that with an increasing solemnity they are leading you toward the one great thought of Lent—true and godly sorrow and sincere repentance for sin.

As you push on in the examination of the appointed services of the Prayer Book, you find that Ash Wednesday opens the door to a season of forty days of special humiliation, self-examination and prayer. The name which this day bears is one which grew out of an old custom now long disused, of employing ashes as a token of mourning. To us the mere name is nothing, except as it serves to mark the day on which we begin the solemn season to which it introduces us.

But the stranger in our Church naturally asks, what the six weeks of the Lenten season signify? Why do we set apart this fixed period for special religious exercises? What is the nature of the appointed worship during these forty days?

The answer must needs be brief. But its philosophy is rooted deep in the necessities of our spiritual life. The growing Christian is one who obeys the apostolic direction to "pray without ceasing." He may not every moment be touching the keys of the instrument, but he does keep it in tune ready to respond with the music dear to the ear of God. Yet nothing is more certain than that, with all this constant prayerfulness of spirit, he must have *appointed times to pray.*

But what is true of the member of the Church is equally true of the whole body. What is needed in each day's journey, is needed in the whole year.

We have pressing upon us an imperious demand of our spiritual nature, that some period in every year should be made a time of special and peculiar self-examination and reconsecration to the service of the Master. Can there be any clearer proof of this fact than the evidence which meets us in the annual efforts in revival work, put forth each year by our sister churches? Not one of them which does not have its Lenten season. It may differ in its date and its duration from our own. It may bear a different name. But the idea and the object are absolutely the same. Some of our Methodist brethren may object to the Lenten season. But their own "protracted meetings" are really a Lent under another name. The Evangelical Alliance, composed of the Gospel loving

churches of the Protestant world, has not hesitated to appoint a fixed season as "a week of prayer." If the Reformed Episcopalian believes that he needs thus to set apart six weeks instead of one, he is only carrying out to a fuller degree the principle established by other evangelical Christians.

During this solemn season our services constantly emphasize the fact of our own sinfulness. Like John the Baptist, they are preachers of repentance. But with a fullness which the rough-clad herald of Christ never exhibited in his proclamation of the Lamb of God, they reveal an atoning Saviour.

Step by step, they lead us on through the weeks, until in Passion Week—the close of Lent—they dwell upon a suffering Saviour in all the details of His atoning work. With Good Friday we look upon the cross and behold our Substitute before the law, which we have broken; as He bears "our sins in His own body on the tree."

Easter Sunday comes to set God's seal to Christ's completed sacrifice. It leads us to the empty sepulchre, and while it testifies to the Father's acceptance of the finished work of the Son, it also assures the believer that the same power which burst the seal and rolled away the stone, shall raise his body from the grave, to be gloriously immortal.

Time forbids more than an allusion to the remainder of the Christian Year. We set apart a day to commemorate the Ascension of our Lord, and thus to keep in mind the grand work of Jesus in the present, as "He ever liveth to make intercession for us." Then on Whitsunday we recall that Pentecost when "a nation was born in a day." Thus each year we preclude the possibility that the Reformed Episcopalian should ever forget the person, the work, or the office of the Holy Ghost.

On Trinity Sunday we bear our testimony with the Christian Church of all ages, to the central truth of the three-fold personality in one eternal Godhead.

The objection has been sometimes urged that by thus affixing to a certain period of the year, the special consideration of some one duty, or doctrine, or fact in our Lord's career on earth, we abridge the liberty of the Christian minister. It has been argued that thus to narrow the range of topics toward which our minds and hearts are turned, is to leave no room for a thousand themes perfectly in accord with Gospel preaching, and to crowd out a host of Scripture subjects which do not *directly* belong to any of the Sundays from Advent to Easter. A glance at the Prayer Book affords the sufficient answer. Following Trinity Sunday, come the twenty-five Sundays after Trinity.

While each of them has its collect, epistle, and gospel, in perfect harmony with each other, the services do not prescribe any one great theme, like those of Christmas, Easter, or Whitsunday. Thus through fully one-half of the Sundays of the year, our Church has plainly permitted the widest range of expository preaching.

It may be well at this point to notice that the Church Year of the Reformed Episcopalian differs in one important feature from that of the Protestant Episcopal Church. In our revision of the Prayer Book we dropped the special services for what were called "saints' days." We were willing to honor apostles and martyrs, even as they followed in the footsteps of Christ. But when we found that the Church of Rome had multiplied these days commemorative of so-called "saints," till the three hundred and sixty-five days of the year were not half enough to give one day to each —when we found that ritualists and Romanizers were constantly adding to the number of names to be remembered by some holy day, we felt that the line must somewhere be sharply and clearly drawn. We therefore made the Christian Year to be a memorial of no sinful mortal, however pure His life, or glorious His death. From one end to the other, it reveals "Jesus only." Like the old painter, who, finding that in his picture of the Lord's supper, the chalice which held the wine

drew the admiration of beholders, and so in his jealousy for Christ's glory, dashed his brush through the rare painting of the cup—we blotted out from our Church Year, all which could distract attention from Jesus our Lord.

Our rapid glance at what constitutes the Christian Year, has already suggested some of the reasons why every Reformed Episcopalian should avail himself of the helps to growth which it affords. Let us briefly sum them up.

We do not for one moment claim that the Scripture requires any such observance. We dare not, therefore, if we would, impose the Christian Year upon any Christian's conscience. St. Paul would stir in his bloody grave to rebuke us, as he rebuked the Galatian Church, if we demanded that believers should keep these appointed days as *essential* to the Christian life.

Christmas, Lent, Easter, Whitsunday can all be traced back to a very early period of the Church's history. (Wheatley. Proctor on the Prayer Book. Whytehead on the Prayer Book.) But there is no footprint which they have left upon the Scriptures of the New Testament.

Let us not, however, forget that we have no Bible evidence that Christians in apostolic days built churches and devoted them to worship. No text of the Bible clearly proves family prayer to be a Christian duty. No line of the Word

of God prescribes the gathering of children in a Sunday school. Not a proof-text can be adduced for the use of instruments of music in Christian worship. Yet the overwhelming majority of intelligent believers would feel that Christianity was losing ground in the world, if church edifices were no longer erected, if the family altar were thrown down, if Sunday schools were to shut their doors, and if no organ were to accompany sacred song. Why do we value these things? Not because God's word prescribes them. But because while in themselves in harmony with the spirit of the New Testament, Christian experience has found them *useful.* We have applied to them the test of utility, and are satisfied with the result.

On precisely the same basis does the Reformed Episcopalian place the Christian Year. It has passed through the fiery crucible of at least fourteen centuries. (Wheatley, p. 212. Whytehead's Key to the Prayer Book, pp. 110, 111.) It has come forth like silver refined in the fires. What then, is the value of the prescribed arrangement of the Christian Year?

It constantly *preaches Christ.* The ancient Romans used to say that every road in the vast empire led to Rome. So does every one of these appointed services lead to the atoning Son of God. History and experience are witnesses that no canon law and no ecclesiastical discipline, can ever

build walls strong enough and lofty enough to shut out false ministers and teachers of error from the Church. But if every pulpit in the Reformed Episcopal Church were to be filled by a Judas, betraying the Saviour, if every minister were to preach what St. Paul calls "another Gospel," the services of the Christian Year would brand him as false, and contradict his utterances.

Do not let us forget that the order and system of these appointed services, are calculated to build up *a symmetrical and well balanced religion.* Men are apt to be like the lonely trees on our wind-swept prairies. The branches of the cottonwood are often only on the side of the trunk opposite to the source of the prevailing winds. Christians are prone to become one-sided in their growth. Ministers frequently allow some true doctrine to become a hobby, absorbing all their pulpit-teaching. But he who is guided by the Christian Year, finds himself led to give to each great truth its due proportion. He may preach on the Resurrection at Christmas, or the Crucifixion at Whitsuntide, or tell the story of Christ's birth at Good Friday—but all the while, the appointed services utter their rebuke. And if, through all the year, he dwell on some one favorite theme—however important it may be—the Prayer Book rings out like a trumpet, voicing the

demand of the people for instruction in the whole, instead of a part of Gospel truth.

Hence, too, the Church Year is an additional *security of the lay membership of the Church.* When you commit your spiritual guidance to a pastor, you do not mean to become a passenger in a balloon, driven here and there by every wind of heaven. You mean to trust yourself to his guidance as to that of the pilot on an ocean steamer, who follows day by day the instructions of his chart. The map which the Christian Year marks out, is ever open to the examination of the lay member of the Reformed Episcopal Church. He has a right to demand that his minister shall be guided by it.

Last of all, the Church Year is a help to *Christian unity.*

A hundred years ago, outside of the Episcopal Church, the celebration of the great festivals of the Christian Year was looked upon by the majority of American Protestants as a relic of Roman superstition. But to day, Christmas, Easter, Whitsunday, even Good Friday and Ascension Day, are kept with appropriate services by thousands of evangelical churches, and by vast numbers of evangelical Christians. Some of our leading religious papers, with no Episcopal or liturgical affiliations, have strongly urged that the "week of prayer"

should be made to conform in date with the first week of the Lenten season.

Dr. Charles W. Shields, a distinguished clergyman of the Presbyterian Church, in a paper which has evoked the deepest and most wide-spread interest, has argued that "to restore more fully the links of the Christian Year, which are already socially and legally recognized among us, and to let them be illustrated by the epistles and gospels which have marked their circuit for centuries past," would be a long step in the direction of uniting the Christian Churches of the United States. (*Century* Mag., Nov., 1885.)

Such is our Christian Year. Eloquent of Christ alone, purged from all superstitious honors to saints who were but fallen men, building up Christian character in symmetrical proportion, and ever bringing into closer fellowship with each other, all who are in fellowship with Jesus, it claims the love and intelligent appreciation of every Reformed Episcopalian. May we so use it here, that we may be better fitted for that Church whose years are the cycles of eternal joy! Amen.

THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN AND HIS DUTY TO HIS OWN CHURCH.

"*Walk about Zion, and go round about her; tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generation following,*" Psalm xlviii: 12, 13.

It is natural to find in Mount Zion a type of Christ's visible Church. It was the centre of the Hebrew worship. There every religious rite was performed by God's appointed priesthood. There sacrifice and incense, the appeal of prayer and the gladness of praise consecrated and hallowed the chosen seat of Israel's God.

We surely may transfer to the Christian Church, where "a royal priesthood" of all true believers offer up spiritual sacrifices, something of the honor with which the Jew regarded Zion. That honor, says the Psalmist, demanded a survey of the holy mountain. It only required that God's people should know how glorious their seat of worship was, to lead them to feel a profound love and reverence for it.

Above all, such study of the towers and palaces of Zion, would enable them to teach their children how beautiful and holy was God's house. They

were to "go round about Zion, that they might tell it to the generation following." With a kindred thought concerning our own Church, I enter upon the closing sermon of this course.

I. The duty of the Reformed Episcopalian involves an intelligent acquaintance with the principles and methods of his own Church.

Membership of a church is like a garment which touches one at every possible point of contact. It has to do with every department of our life. It is meant to influence us in public and private. It ought to control our daily business as our daily devotion. It should have a place in our work and our recreation. It belongs to our relations in the family, the sanctuary and the scene of our every day labor.

The world has surely a right to expect that we shall grasp with a thorough comprehension that which touches our life at such a multitude of points.

I once sat beside the driver of a California stage coach, as we rattled down a pitch-dark road at dead midnight. We were in the heights of the Sierra Nevada. I knew that the narrow highway skirted the edge of sheer precipices, and made sharp curves, where the least mistake meant certain death. Turning to my companion, I asked how it was possible for him to find his way along such a path at such an hour. The gruff reply was a

question: "How do you find your way about your own house in the dark?"

There was a world of philosophy in that rough answer. It meant that he could literally feel his way on that wild road, because as familiar with it as one becomes with every room and passage of the home in which he dwells.

The church to which one belongs, is his home. A Christian who is ignorant of his own church, ought to be as rare as the man who knows nothing of the house in which he dwells.

The reasons which demand intelligent acquaintance with one's own branch of the universal Church, lie upon the surface.

One of these is, that thorough knowledge of His own household of faith, will always tend to make the Christian *a better member of the whole family of Christ.* It has been my lot on several different occasions to visit frontier outposts of our army. One fact arrested my attention. Every cavalryman was a better soldier because devoted to his own branch of the service. The infantry soldier stood by his country's flag all the more bravely, because he believed in infantry organization and tactics. Nor was the artilleryman one whit behind in military discipline and courage, because that arm of the service was in his eyes the most important to success. But each soldier's deep attachment to his own special organization, was

based on the fact that he was thoroughly familiar with its details. Such intimate acquaintance with his own department of the army, did not lead to a want of broad patriotism, or to disloyalty to the flag which floated over all.

A man may have a blind, fanatical zeal for his own church, which leads him to look on all other Christians as outside of the pale of salvation. He may magnify his own branch of the Church Catholic, till every other shall appear as an enemy of the cause. But such a Christian is the product—not of thorough knowledge of his own church, but of ignorance regarding it. The proof of that position is readily adduced from our own acquaintance with religious bigotry. Take the Romanist who narrows the scope of Christ's salvation to those of his own communion; and you will almost invariably find that just in proportion to his intense bigotry, is his ignorance of his own Church in its history, doctrines, and methods. Intelligent study of the Reformed Episcopal Church will only make the Reformed Episcopalian more zealous for the cause in which all true believers are united, and more broad and comprehensive in his charity toward all who bear his Master's name.

Then too, let it not be forgotten that a thorough acquaintance with one's own church, is like an anchor which *keeps the Christian from aimless drifting.*

The old proverb, "A rolling stone gathers no moss," is nowhere more applicable than in the sphere of religion. I should be the last to assail the Christian who from strong conviction that he could better serve Christ, or grow in grace, by changing his church relations, withdraws from one communior to enter another. In every leading denomination are laymen and ministers who shine as lights, and hold the front rank in earnest Christian work, whose education and early life attached them to some church which convictions of duty led them to leave for another. I am not speaking of such. Our country owes a debt of gratitude which it can never pay, to men who forsook their early home across the sea, to cast their lot with the people of this great Republic. The West has been developed and enriched by immigration from the older States. On the same principle every branch of the Church is under inestimable obligation to those who have entered its fold from other portions of Christ's vast household. But immigration is one thing. Restless, unreasoning roving is another. In religion, as in national life, there are immigrants, and there are mere tramps I know one individual who, in the twenty five years of my acquaintance with him, has changed his church relations from one denomination to another no less than eight times. The average duration of his membership of any one commu-

nion, is but a fraction over three years. Such a Christian becomes a positive injury to the cause of Christ. He weakens the church he enters more than the one he forsakes. Above all, he leads the world outside to sneer at the want of any deep conviction underlying his church relations. Can you conceive of such a man as thoroughly grasping the truth as held by any branch of the Church? If in any evangelical communion he had struck down the roots of a real study into its principles and spirit, it would have saved the Church at large from contempt, and himself from a life like that of a wandering Bedouin.

How many professing Christians too, are to be found, who while not formally severing their ecclesiastical relations, yet roam here and there from one place of worship to another, as fancy or inclination may dictate. Attracted to one church by the music, to another by sensational preaching, or to a third by some theatrical ritualism, they add nothing to the spiritual strength of the fold to which they belong, while they undermine their own religious life. Such souls can no more build up their spiritual strength, than a man can maintain vigorous health, who forsakes the plain and wholesome food spread upon the home table, to wander from restaurant to restaurant, seeking unaccustomed delicacies. But such Christians are never to be found in the class who

honestly endeavor to be informed as to the principles of their own church. The man who forms an intelligent acquaintance with whatever is peculiar to his own communion, and who sincerely tries to lay hold of its doctrines and methods, roots himself in that church so that he feels his personal responsibility for it, and kindles in his heart a love for its worship, which no mere accident of music, or the style of the preacher, or the accessories of the place of meeting, can affect.

But while all this is true to a certain extent, of any evangelical Christian, it is ten-fold true of the Reformed Episcopalian.

For this Church is the youngest of the sisterhood of evangelical churches. While in one sense it is as old as the English Reformation, and while it justly claims to be the Protestant Episcopal Church as founded by Bishop White and his colaborers, its separate existence is measured by only a few short years. It came into being in a period of Christian history when the drift of religious movements was toward union rather than separation. The mere fact that it is the result of a secession from an ancient and powerful communion, tends to create prejudice against it. The Reformed Episcopalian stands in the attitude of one who is bound to give satisfactory reasons for his position among the churches.

Now and then, I am approached by members of

my own flock, who tell me that in their intercourse with others, in their chance acquaintance formed in time of summer recreation, and in their correspondence even with those who hold to them mere business relations—they are asked to explain precisely the nature of this Church; how it differs from that out of which it sprang; and what are its doctrinal positions. And only too often, they tell me that they have been compelled by their own ignorance to admit their inability to give any satisfactory reply. Yet if there be any church in existence whose members need an intelligent understanding of its principles, it is the Reformed Episcopal Church.

But how shall our own people obtain such thorough comprehension of their own doctrines and methods?

First of all, by a searching study of our *Book of Common Prayer*. Ours is a distinctively liturgical Church. Its ministers are bound by their ordination promises to "conform to the worship" which is prescribed in the Prayer Book. And within the covers of that formulary of public devotion, brief as it is, can be found the whole system of this Church. The vast majority of all classes of Episcopalians use a Prayer Book as they do their Sunday clothes. It is a book simply for their guidance in worship once a week. Consequently it is never opened from Sunday to Sunday. It is this

simple fact which explains why thousands in the Protestant Episcopal Church, intensely evangelical, avowedly low church in their sympathies, and viewing with abhorrence any departure from Scripture teaching, have been perfectly satisfied to regard their own Prayer Book as next to the Bible in their esteem and love. In that book are services—like those for ordination and the consecration of bishops, for the institution of a rector and the visitation of the sick, which are so rarely witnessed in actual use, that multitudes have never heard them. But who carefully studies them at home? They may contain the seeds and germs of Romanism; but these are unnoticed, because they are not forced every week upon the attention of the worshipper in church.

It is with deep conviction that I venture the statement, that if the earnest and spiritually-minded laity of the old Church were to take up their own Book of Common Prayer, outside of the place of worship, and compare its teachings with those of the Bible, it would lead directly and inevitably to a vast exodus from that communion into the Reformed Episcopal Church. *Our* Prayer Book courts such study and comparison.

Some of you have crossed the Alps. Have you never seen, a little distance from your road, but diverging from it, the ancient highway now deserted, but on which perhaps the old Romans were

wont to journey? In every case your eye, at a single glance, took in the cause which led to the change. It made the route shorter, or it straightened a crooked pathway, or it avoided some perilous pass. So every change from our old Prayer Book which has been made in that with which we worship to-day, has its obvious reason. With John the Baptist fidelity to Scripture, it has made "the path straight."

I plead then, with every Reformed Episcopalian that he will make his liturgy something more than a mere directory of public worship. A serious private study of the Prayer Book cannot fail to furnish him such knowledge of his own Church as will put it in his power to answer every question which honest inquirers may make as to the principles of the Reformed Episcopal Church.

Next in importance as a source of information, stands the *history* of this Church.

Patriotic Americans who lived in those stirring times, when the great civil war shook the foundations of our country, complain that there is a dearth of books which clearly explain the causes out of which that tremendous struggle sprang. They realize that the rising generation, born since the war was ended, are uninstructed in the great principles which lay at the foundation of the most momentous events in our national life.

A kindred difficulty besets the Reformed Epis-

copal Church. Its real history dates back to the English Reformation. Its Prayer Book is, in its main features, as old as the reign of Edward the Sixth. But the causes, which, working in the hearts of evangelical Episcopalians, produced at last a separate organization in the year 1873, is unknown to thousands of our own people.

No formal history of this Church has as yet been given to the world. But the materials of such a record are within the reach of all. In the form of tracts and pamphlets published by our Reformed Episcopal Publication Society, and in the biography of Bishop Cummins, the member of our Church who really desires to be informed as to what this Church is, and why it exists, can find the history of conscientious struggles which resulted in the formation of this communion. Especially do I commend to you the story of the life of him whom God graciously gave to us as our first bishop. A purer and lovelier life, a more Christ-like fidelity to duty, a more unselfish sacrifice for principle, cannot be found in the records of "the noble army of martyrs."

Such is the first duty to his own Church resting on every Reformed Episcopalian. If other Christians can afford to be ignorant of the principles and methods of the branch of Christ's Church to which they may belong, he cannot. The world around him, the religious sentiment of the nine-

teenth century, and the interests of his own communion imperatively demand that he shall be able to "give to every man that asketh, a reason for the hope that is in" him.

II. THE DUTY OF THE REFORMED EPISCOPALIAN INVOLVES EARNEST WORK IN THE UPBUILDING AND STRENGTHENING OF HIS OWN CHURCH.

Faith and works are bound together by a ligament which it is always perilous to sever. When Saul of Tarsus was stricken to earth as he hurried along the Damascus road, he recognized Jesus of Nazareth as the One who spoke from the skies. It was but the germ of faith. Weak, ignorant, imperfect, he nevertheless believed that the once persecuted Galilean was the "Lord." But how quickly did works follow in the track of his faith! He cannot conceive of believing on Christ, without obeying Christ. Forthwith he cries, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" From that day onward, Saul's question has been repeated by every soul which has truly believed on Christ. A living faith always kindles a fire which blazes forth in fervent desire to work in the cause of the Saviour.

But all Christian experience goes to show that the best workers for the Master have been those who gave their labor *along the lines marked out by that branch of the Church to which they belonged.*

Such an assertion may involve the charge of nar

rowness and sectarian bigotry. But a moment's serious and impartial consideration will refute the cruel accusation. There is a noble work which is being done by instrumentalities belonging to no one branch of the Christian Church. Union movements, such as the Bible Society, the Tract Society, and, above all, the Young Men's Christian Association, composed of evangelical believers of every denomination, are the glory of the nineteenth century. But who are the leaders in every one of these vast agencies for the spread of the Gospel? In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred you will find them to be men who also take the lead in all the activities of the particular Church to which they belong. Where you find a Christian so needlessly broad in his catholicity, that he has no warm love for his own communion, you will also find one who does no real or valuable service in any union organization for the evangelizing of the world. But that is only the negative side of the argument. There is a positive side. History and experience are concurring witnesses that the best results in Christian work have been accomplished by men who were bound together by a deep attachment to some one branch of the great Church of Christ. What would have been this western region of our country but for the pioneer evangelization of the Methodist Church? Planted on this continent after every other great denomination had a foot-

hold, it numbers to day two millions and a half of members in the United States and Canada. It has done a work for the newer regions of our land for which every Christian ought to be devoutly grateful.

But there is no church in all Christendom, unless it be the Church of Rome, which has so compact a denominational organization. There exists no Protestant communion which is so intensely devoted to working on its own denominational lines. A Methodist is a Methodist wherever he goes. He is bound to his own Church by ties which attach him to its peculiar methods. No body of Christians has to such a degree the quality for which our English tongue has no expression, but which the French would call "*esprit de corps.*" It is because they move as one solid phalanx, strong in their devotion to their denominational work, that they have wrought such marvelous results for the cause of universal Christianity.

Precisely that spirit and that kind of work is the need of the Reformed Episcopal Church. Our danger lies, not in the direction of any sectarian narrowness, but rather in that of allowing our broad catholicity to lead us to undervalue our own Church.

To the Gulf Stream the most advanced and civilized countries of the world owe the fact that they are not icy deserts, uninhabitable to man. But it

the heated waters of the Gulf Stream were diffused through the whole breadth of the Atlantic, their power would be nothing. One with the ocean, yet retaining its own integrity and form as a mighty river, the Gulf Stream moves on to bless the earth.

Let us enter heartily into every union movement for the spread of the truth of Christ. But let it be our aim to be a compact and organized body, strong in individuality, warming a cold world because warmed ourselves by devotion to the special trust God has committed to us.

Let me suggest one or two reasons why you should love and work for your own Church.

To some of you it presents a claim like that which one's birthplace has upon his affection. It was in the Reformed Episcopal Church, in its clear presentation of the Gospel of Jesus, that you found your first hope in Christ. But for its work you would be still in the darkness where you once wandered.

Do you remember how one of our leading scientific men, lost in the vast Yellowstone region and chilled by the nightly cold of the mountains, saved his life by a magnifying lens which chanced to be in his pocket? It was the sun's rays which gave the needed fire. But it was the lens which concentrated them. Christ alone saved you. But the warmth of His truth came to your chilled soul through the

concentrating medium of the Church to which you belong. Christ deserves your first love. But next to Him your love is due to the instrumentality He used.

But the Reformed Episcopal Church is entitled to your loving and earnest work because of *what it is in itself.* These sermons have indeed been vain, if they have not shown you that your own Church is above all things else a Church faithful to the word of God. It knows no doctrine, no form of service, no religious practice, which cannot bear the test of the plummet and line of the Bible.

Moreover, while this Church is conservative of all that antiquity has transmitted, which is of genuine spiritual worth, it is progressive in meeting the real wants of the Christian in the nineteenth century. Liturgical, yet allowing free prayer; Episcopal, yet honoring the ministry otherwise ordained, retaining a communion service hallowed by long ages of Christian use, yet inviting to the Lord's table "all who love our Divine Lord and Saviour in sincerity"—it constitutes the once "missing link" in the unity of the visible Church.

It has a claim, too, upon your zeal and effort, because its *special work* is one which no other church can do.

The Protestant Episcopal Church in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States is a vast, wealthy and powerful organization. Its adherents

in England and America are numbered by millions. But the steady drift of that Church for fifty years has been toward a false and unscriptural view of the sacraments and the ministry, more and more nearly approximating that of the Church of Rome. Its public worship has so completely changed, that if good old Bishop White were to return to earth, he would not know the Church which he founded. A gaudy ritualism has supplanted the simple yet majestic service which we "old-fashioned Episcopalians" once delighted in. To complete the sad picture, we need only add that the last General Convention of that Church, narrowly escaped a vote striking out from the title page of its Prayer Book the name "Protestant," while subsequent events clearly indicate that such an obliteration of all which suggests the English Reformation, has been postponed but a few short years. The laity alone prevented such action in 1886. But the laity are powerless to check the drift. Already there is a deep unrest among members of that Church. Where can they go? Some, it is true, drift into other evangelical communions. But they rarely find themselves at home. They want an Episcopal Church. They crave liturgical worship. They miss the ancient order of the Christian year. Their taste cultivated in the forms of the Book of Common Prayer, revolts against a thousand things which are attractive to those

differently trained. The number of such laymen is steadily increasing. Unhappy in their own Church because it has ceased to be what it once was, and because they cannot in conscience approve Romish doctrine in the pulpit, and Romish worship in the chancel, such souls are unable to find their wants met in any non-liturgical Church. There are thousands who would hail the Reformed Episcopal Church as "the haven where they would be," if zeal and liberality on our part opened our services side by side with every ritualistic place of worship in the country. But restricted as we have been for means to extend our Church, and hitherto without a seminary for the training of our young men for the ministry, such laymen are largely ignorant that such a relief exists as our Church would afford them. I have actually known a lay member of the old Church to be agreeably surprised to find that we held the doctrine of the Trinity, and others who supposed that we worshipped without the aid of a liturgy, and still others amazed to find that our clergy wore the old vestments in the public service. Surely here is the *special field* of the Reformed Episcopal Church. We are the only organized body of Christians who can offer to them the old-fashioned Episcopal Church, which our fathers of the revolutionary epoch founded We can give them the three-fold ministry, the historic episcopate, the liturgy in its purity, and the Church

year with its orderly teaching. Our old friends may scorn our aid for a time, but the day is surely coming when the evangelical laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church will see that their only hope is in the Church which we offer them.

Do any of you feel stirred to ask *how* you can most effectively enlist yourselves in work for this beloved Church?

Begin at home. Realize your own responsibility for the Church to which, in God's sight, you solemnly gave yourself when your name was enrolled among its members. Say to yourself, "This is the Church—not of my bishop, my pastor, my church-officers—but of myself. It is my Church. God holds me responsible for the work to be done by this communion. I am not responsible for what the other churches are doing, but for the success and usefulness of the Reformed Episcopal Church."

Such a sense of responsibility will lead you first of all, to hold up the hands of your pastor by a regular attendance on your own appointed place of worship. The prevalent habit of roving from one church to another has its root in a conscience blunted to a profound sense of Christian duty. I may be welcome to sit down at my neighbor's table. I may find there highly-spiced food. But as a member of a household, I am deserting the

place which belongs to me, and creating a gap in the family circle which no one else can fill.

Then, too, such a sense of my responsibility, will make me a Reformed Episcopalian whether at home or abroad. When passing a Sunday in some distant city, my first inquiry will be not where I may enjoy the best music, or hear the most eloquent preaching, but whether there is there a band of Reformed Episcopalians—however small in numbers or wealth—whom I may encourage by my presence. I will seek out the minister, and give him the God-speed of my fellow communicants. In one word, I will interest myself in the *whole Church* to which I belong. Wherever are Reformed Episcopalians, there are my brothers and my sisters. Such interest will lead me to take the one religious paper which is the organ of our Church. I will endeavor to be informed as to what our Church is doing outside the narrow limits of my own parish. I can only gain such information in the columns of the Episcopal Recorder.

What deep interest, too, ought every Reformed Episcopalian to feel in the gift which God has led one member of our Church to bestow upon it—our long desired, yet long deferred blessing of a Theological Seminary. Through twelve years of our ecclesiastical history, we were compelled to place our young candidates for the ministry under the care of "schools of the prophets"

belonging to other churches. It separated them from all Episcopal and liturgical influences. It gave them a training in no way fitting them for our special work.

But just when our hope was dying out that we should ever have a Theological Seminary of our own, God led one member of our Church to provide such a school with noble buildings and splendid site, at a cost of nearly a quarter of a million of dollars. Our Seminary needs additional endowments of professorships. It calls on every Reformed Episcopalian to supplement what one Christian woman has been led by God's grace to do. It appeals to us for such personal interest in its work as shall make it for all time a fountain of blessing to our entire communion.

This sense of responsibility will lead parents to train their children up in the principles and the ways of their own Church. All honor to the Sunday school work. No man shall question my loyalty to it. But I do not hesitate to say that if we allow the children to substitute attendance on the Sunday school for worship in the church, then we are perverting the Sunday school from its real design. If your children are old enough to be enrolled in the Sunday school, they are old enough to attend one church service on the Sunday. If you must choose between the two, I unhesitatingly say that the child trained from his earliest years to the use of

the Prayer Book, and encouraged to participate in the worship it provides, will more surely become an intelligent and spiritually-minded Christian, than the child who attends a Sunday school, and neglects the services of the sanctuary.

Last, but not least, such a sense of responsibility will lead us to liberality in giving, and constancy in praying for our Church.

When a wealthy Christian, during our long years of commercial distress following the panic of 1873, was asked why he doubled his subscriptions to religious work, he answered, "Because the times are so hard." So I say to every Reformed Episcopalian, because this Church is so young, and so poor, and so scattered, because upon this generation rests the responsibility and the honor of laying its foundations amidst reproach and difficulty, therefore it has a double claim upon your self-denying liberality. It needs your gifts as no other stronger, older and richer organization needs the silver and the gold of its members.

For the very same reason this Church appeals to you for your earnest prayers in its behalf. A Christian parent prays for that child who is in the midst of peril, with an intensity beyond all his intercession for the others of his flock. What supplications from secret closet and family-altar shielded as with the white wings of the angels, the soldier-boy in the fore-front of the hottest battle!

But this young Church, with a life measured by only fourteen years, is in the heat of fierce battle which other churches hardly know. Misunderstood by other evangelical churches, bitterly assailed by the Church out of which it came, upholding the Gospel banner against ritualism on the one hand, and a loose free thinking on the other, it appeals to you for daily remembrance at the throne.

Let no difficulties lead you to despond. Discouragement can only come to those Reformed Episcopalians who shut their eyes to what God has wrought.

How brief a space in history is fourteen years! Across its track my memory flies to that scene where seven ministers and a handful of laymen gathered around our sainted leader. I recall the birth of a Church without one organized parish or a solitary place of worship. I look to the present, and see that same Church rooted in American soil from ocean to ocean. I mark its parishes in the Dominion of Canada stretching from Puget Sound to the Bay of Fundy. I cross the ocean and find it growing in strength and influence in England and even in Scotland. I see it possessed of real property amounting to millions of dollars. I am no prophet; but if this be the fruit of our work in fourteen years, what shall this Church be

when a century shall have marked the story of its life!

My self-imposed task is done. It has been a labor of love, in this course of sermons, to lead my hearers to "walk about Zion and tell the towers thereof." I am thankful to God thus to have borne my spoken testimony. But still more grateful am I to know that these words of mine shall reach beyond those who hear them, and outlive my own personal ministry. If I may hope that in printed form they shall help to "tell the generation following," the story of the birth and early years of this beloved Church, and if, when my tongue is still, they shall aid to make known "what Reformed Episcopalians believe"—I can joyfully say, "Now, Lord, lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace."

APPENDIX.

A.—Page 23.

The leading advocate of the view here referred to, that Baptism produces a regeneration totally distinct from any moral and spiritual change, is Bishop Hobart. His sermons on this topic are very emphatic in repudiating the idea that any change of heart and nature is produced by the act of Baptism. He was, however, too honest not to admit that in this position he was out of accord with the drift of the teaching of his own High Church party in the English Church. He speaks of their "want of precision," and adds, "Among the writers who have fallen into this inaccuracy of language, are the two celebrated and eloquent preachers, Dr. Barrow and Bishop Tillotson." Hobart's Works, vol. ii : p. 466,

Bishop Hobart's view is most clearly expressed in his own language;—"As St. Paul saith, 'By one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body.' So that in the very act of baptizing, the Spirit unites us unto Christ, and makes us members of His body; and if of His body, then of His Church and Kingdom, that being all of His body. And therefore all who are rightly baptized with water, being at the same time also baptized with the Holy Ghost, and so born both of the water and the Spirit, they are *ipso facto* admitted into the kingdom of God established upon earth; and if it be not their own fault,

will as certainly attain to that which is in heaven. It is much to be lamented that many divines of the Church of England have fallen into the modern error, which originated in the Calvinistic school, of applying the word *regeneration* to denote the work of grace on the heart, the operations of the Divine Spirit in forming holy affections in the soul, and in leading us to newness of life. This most important and essential change, which in Scriptural and primitive language is termed the *renewing* of the Holy Ghost—renovation—many excellent and orthodox divines of our Church, following unfortunately the fashion of the times, style *regeneration*."

Bishop Alfred Lee in his little work on Baptism, in which he endeavors to establish the hypothetical theory of regeneration, alludes to this language of Bishop Hobart, and comparing it with the teaching of the Apostle John in his first epistle (1 John ii: 29; iii: 9-14; iv: 7; v: 1-18), pertinently asks, "How came the Apostle John to fall into this modern error of the Calvinistic school?"

Bishop Hobart's view gained wide acceptance in the Protestant Episcopal Churches in this country, but is now well-nigh given up as untenable by the majority of the Clergy of that Church.

In one of the more recent High Church works upon this subject, that of the Rev. Dr. Adams of Nashotah Theological Seminary, I have been unable so much as to find an allusion to it, although the lack of an index of topics may have led me to my failure to discover such notice.

B.—Page 23.

"Goode on Baptism," is a work of profound erudition, and one which has been the main reliance of those Evangelical teachers of the Church of England who hold to the so-called "charitable theory" of Baptism. But it is worth noticing that Mr. Goode himself feels the almost insurmountable difficulties which attend his explanations of the service. He says (p. 468), "The mistakes and misconstructions to which this principle has led would probably be *now* considered as affording strong reasons against it. My own view would *even in theory*, apart from the experience of results, be adverse to the use of such language."

"Fisher on the Prayer-Book,"—a treatise of which the late Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter, so famous in the well-known Gorham case, says, "It is the work of one who is a scholar, a lawyer, a logician, and a Christian gentleman,"—thus comments upon the generally-accepted Baptismal theory of the Evangelical party in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States and Great Britian: "The Charitable Hypothesis, as applied to the interpretation of the Baptismal Service, involves nothing less than an obvious violation of the most indispensable rules of grammar and of logic. It does not consist, as in the case of the oft-quoted passage, 'This is my Body,' in the mere substitution of a metaphorical instead of a literal rendering of a *term;* but rather in the admission of a *non-natural* in the place of the *natural* interpretation of an entire *proposition*. As to the natural sense of the declaration, 'This child is regenerate,' there can be surely but one opinion. We

shall search in vain for any rule of logical or grammatical interpretation, to justify the assumption, that by such an expression room is left for doubt or contingency. The assertion of the infant's regeneracy is absolute, positive and unconditional. Whatever be the meaning attached to either of the terms of the proposition, and whatever be the precise theological interpretation of the word 'regenerate,' the substance of the proposition itself still remains essentially the same. It is still undeniably categorical; so that to interpret it hypothetically, is to alter its very essence, and involves nothing less than a positive contradiction of a singularly plain and luminous statement. . . . The question before us, it should be remembered, is a question not of things, but of words. The point to be ascertained is not whether, in the case supposed, a 'charitable' hope may reasonably be entertained; but whether such hope is properly expressed by the phraseology employed in the service. These are two perfectly distinct subjects of inquiry. And what, it may reasonably be asked, can the 'judgment,' even of the most charitable *expectation*, have to do with a case where nothing but the most absolute certainty can justify the phraseology employed?"

C.—Page 82.

In Chapin's "Primitive Church," pp. 407–409, a bold and seemingly authoritative denial is given to the recognized fact of history that the English Church, down to the period of the Stuart restoration, received as ministers in its parishes, clergymen who had no other than Presbyterial ordination. It seems necessary, therefore,

to give the plain historic ground for the statement on page 82.

Keble is certainly one whose authority ought to be respected by the highest advocates of the Apostolic Succession. Yet he writes (See the preface to Hooker, p. 38), "For nearly up to the time when he (Hooker) wrote, numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England, with no better than Presbyterian ordination; and it appears by Traver's Supplication to the Council, that such was the construction not uncommonly put upon the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth, permitting those who had received orders in any other form than that of the English Service Book, on giving certain securities, to exercise their calling in England."

Let us listen to the testimony of Bishop Burnet, "Another point was fixed by the Act of Uniformity, which was more at large formerly; those who came to England from the foreign Churches *had not been required to be ordained among us;* but now all, that had not Episcopal ordination, were made incapable of holding any ecclesiastical benefice." (Burnet's Hist. of his own Times, vol. i: p. 183.)

Strype's Life of Archbishop Grindal (quoted in Goode on Orders), bears the most unequivocal evidence on this point. It gives the exact language of the commission given by Grindal to John Morrison, a minister ordained by Presbyterial hands in Scotland, permitting him to exercise his office in the English Church. It runs as follows: "Since you, the aforesaid John Morrison, about five years past, in the town of Garvet, in the county of Lothian and kingdom of Scotland, were admitted and ordained to sacred orders and the holy ministry, by the imposition of hands, according to the

laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland . . . we therefore as much as lies in us, and as by right we may, *approving and ratifying the form of your ordination and preferment* done in such manner as aforesaid, grant to you a license and faculty, with the consent and express command of the most Reverend Father in Christ, the Lord Edmund, by the Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, to us signified, that *in such orders by you taken*, you may and have power in any convenient places in and throughout the whole province of Canterbury, to celebrate divine offices, to minister the sacraments," &c.

John Cosin, Bishop of Durham, ought to be a witness to whose testimony no high churchman could take exception. He was the friend of Archbishop Laud, and was considered as belonging to the most extreme faction of the party which Laud represented. In a letter written by him from Paris, where he had been driven during the Parliamentary *regime* in England, he says, "Therefore, if at any time a minister so ordained in these French churches, came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have done so of late, and can instance in *many others* before my time) our bishops did not reordain him before they admitted him to his charge, as they must have done if his former ordination here in France had been void. *Nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received among us, and to subscribe the articles established.*"

William Fleetwood, Bishop first of St. Asaph, and afterward of Ely, belongs to the period of the Revolution which placed William of Orange on the throne.

But as he was born during the Cromwellian supremacy, and received his education during the Carolan reigns, he is a most important witness as to the practice prevailing in England while the Stuart kings were assimilating the English Church to that of Rome. He says, in his "Judgment of the Church of England in case of Lay-Baptism," "We had many ministers from Scotland, from France, and from the Low Countries, who were ordained by presbyters only, and not bishops, and they were instituted into benefices with cure, and *yet were never re-ordained*, but only subscribed the articles."

As Mr. Goode, to whose unanswerable work on the Orders of the Church of England, I am indebted for the most of the above quotations, has well said, "If these cases do not prove that at least, our Church has never disowned the validity of the ordinations of the Scotch and foreign non-episcopal Churches, and that her *practice* till the Restoration was to recognize their validity, *nothing would do so.*"

The Rev. J. B. Marsden is a well known and voluminous writer of the Church of England. In his History of the Early Puritans, a work of vast research, he says, speaking of the reign of Elizabeth (pp. 231-235),

"Hitherto Episcopal ordination had not been considered as of the essence of the ministerial commission; indeed there are several remarkable instances in which Presbyterian ministers were not only beneficed in the Church of England, but enjoyed its distinctions, and filled some of its highest posts. The case of Whittingham, Dean of Durham, is well known. He was presented to the deanery soon after Elizabeth's accession, in 1563, having received orders from the Reformed Church at Geneva, in the Presbyterian manner. It

does not appear that his want of Episcopal ordination would have rendered him obnoxious, had it not been for the zeal with which he espoused the Puritan opinions on the subject of the vestments. At length in 1577, Sandys, Archbishop of York, cited him upon several charges, the chief of which was his Genevan ordination. Whittingham however, asserted the rights of the church at Durham, and challenged the Archbishop's power to interfere. He then made his appeal to the queen, who directed a commission to hear and determine the objections alleged against him. The president was Hutton, Dean of York, who expressed his preference for Presbyterian rather than Romish orders, in strong language. 'The Dean,' he said, 'was ordained in better sort than even the Archbishop himself.' Sandys had sufficient influence to obtain another commission, and of this the lord president was a member. When the question of his ordination had been argued, the lord president exclaimed, 'I cannot agree to deprive him for that cause alone; this,' he said, 'would be ill taken by all the godly both at home and abroad; that we allow of popish massing priests in our ministry, and disallow of ministers made in a reformed church.' The commission was again adjourned, and here the business dropped, for the next year the Dean of Durham died.

"The range within which ordination was considered valid in the Church of England in the age succeeding the Reformation, is shown more strongly in the case of Travers, Hooker's celebrated coadjutor at the Temple. It is uncertain whether Travers had received deacon's orders according to the Church of England (for he had a divinity degree from Cambridge), but he was member from the first of the Presbyterian Church at Wandsworth. Going abroad, he was certainly ordained a

presbyter at Antwerp, by the Synod there in 1578. Yet we find him associated with Hooker, as preacher at the Temple, in 1592. During this long interval then, of fourteen years, his Presbyterian orders had been allowed. He was also private tutor in the family of Lord Treasurer Cecil. When at length silenced by Whitgift, it was objected to him, first, that he was not a lawfully ordained minister of the Church of England; secondly, that he preached without a license; thirdly, that he had violated discipline and decency by his public refutation of what Hooker, his superior in the Church, had advanced from the same pulpit upon the same day. Had the first ground been felt by his opponents to be impregnable, the other charges would probably have been omitted, and Travers would have been dismissed, no doubt, in a summary way. But it would seem that the stress was laid chiefly on the two latter articles; and, indeed Travers was prepared with an answer to the first, and with an answer which he did not fail to use. An act had passed in the thirteenth year of Queen Elizabeth, under which he was securely sheltered. It recognizes the validity of foreign orders; and conveys to us historical evidence that ministers ordained by Presbyterian synods were at that time beneficed in the Church of England. It was sufficient that the conforming minister should declare his assent, and subscribe to the Articles of the Church of England. Travers, in his petition to the privy council, pleads the force of this statute, and declares that many Scottish ministers were then holding benefices in England beneath its sanction."

There appears no evidence to show that this bold assertion of Travers was denied, as it certainly would have been, if capable of successful refutation. Nothing

then can be clearer than the plain fact of history, that at the time of this celebrated trial, "*many Scottish ministers*," having no other than presbyterial orders, were holding benefices in the Church of England, under the protection of the law to which Travers himself appealed

The disingenuousness, to call it by no severer term, of the advocates of extreme high church views, is seen in the attempt of Chapin (Primitive Church, pp. 407, 408) to get rid of the clear testimony of history. Alluding to the act of the thirteenth of Elizabeth, he says, "The first section enacts that every minister under the degree of Bishop, who had received ordination or consecration *by any other form than that prescribed by the Ordinal of Edward VI.* (the italics are Dr. Chapin's), should, in a certain limited time, subscribe to the articles of religion, confessions, etc." The obvious conclusion which Dr. Chapin meant his reader to draw from the statement which he so strongly emphasizes by italics, is that this provision was intended to meet the case of men ordained in the Church of England, by some other or later form than that prescribed by the Ordinal of Edward VI. Thus he would escape the natural inference that it was intended to meet the case of the "many" Presbyterian ministers to whom Travers refers. But while italicizing this clause of the law, Dr. Chapin deliberately omits the rest of the language, which makes the whole clause to read, "any other form of institution, consecration, or ordering, than the form set forth by parliament in the time of the late king of most worthy memory, King Edward the Sixth, *or now used in the reign of our most gracious sovereign lady.*"

Nothing can be more evident than that the entire clause was meant to allow ministers ordained by some

other form *than that of the Church of England*, to hold livings, provided they should subscribe to the Articles.

But the want of fair dealing with historic facts, on the part of Dr. Chapin, becomes more inexcusable as he proceeds. In speaking of the subscription required by the statute of Elizabeth, he says, "One of the things they were thus required to sign was the Preface to the Ordinal." This is a gratuitous assertion, for which there is not only no historic authority, but which is in direct contradiction of the statute itself. Its language is, "subscribe to all articles of religion *which only concern the true Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments, comprised in a book intituled Articles*," etc. I have searched in vain the records of the Elizabethan period of the Church of England. to find any proof of the statement that the book "intituled Articles," included the Preface to the Ordinal. A reference to the Prayer Book of the Church of England reveals the "book intituled Articles." appended to the Liturgy, as an addendum, precisely as it was adopted by parliament in the year 1562. It in no way includes or even refers to the Preface of the Ordinal.

At the risk of enlarging this appendix beyond my original intention, I quote in full the statute of Elizabeth, which Dr. Chapin so shamefully garbles to suit the purposes of the high Church party. It is given by Marsden, p. 234:

"Anno xiii. Regina Elizabetha: A. D. 1570; chap. 12—An Act for the ministers of churches to be of sound religion. Be it enacted by the authority of this present parliament, that any person under the degree of a bishop, which doth or shall pretend to be a priest or minister of God's holy words and sacraments, by reason of any other form of institution, consecration, or ordering,

than the form set forth by parliament in the time of the late king of most worthy memory, King Edward VI, or now used in the reign of our most gracious sovereign lady, before the feast of the nativity of Christ next following, shall, in the presence of the bishop, or guardian of the spiritualities of some one diocese where he hath or shall have ecclesiastical living, declare his assent, and subscribe to all articles of religion which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments, comprised in a book imprinted and intituled, Articles, whereupon it was agreed by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God one thousand five hundred and sixty-two, according to the computation of the Church of England, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing consent touching true religion put forth by the queen's authority; and shall bring from such bishop or guardian of spiritualities, in writing, under his seal authentick, a testimonial of such assent and subscription; and openly on some Sunday, in time of public service before noon, in every church where by reason of any ecclesiastical living he ought to attend, read both the said testimonial, and the said articles; upon pain that every such person which shall not before the said feast, do as above appointed, shall be ipso facto deprived, and all his ecclesiastical promotions shall be void, as if he then were naturally dead."

Archbishop Whitgift figures largely in the controversy which arose regarding Travers, alluded to above. That he was a man of harsh spirit and narrow views, is very evident from his bitterness toward the Puritans.

Yet the equal narrowness of that faction in the Elizabethan Church of England, and their petty insistence upon trifling matters, afford much excuse for the temper which Whitgift manifested toward them. But how far, in spite of his intense dislike of the Presbyterians, he was from the position of the modern High Churchman upon the question of the necessity of Episcopal ordination, may be judged from the following extract from his works. It is to be found in his defence of Episcopacy against Cartwright, the Puritan champion:

"But to be short, I confess that in a church collected together in one place, and at liberty, government is necessary in the second kind of necessity, *but that any one kind of government is so necessary that without it the Church cannot be saved, or that it cannot be altered into some other kind thought to be more expedient*, I utterly deny. And the reasons that move me so to do, be these. The first is because *I find no one certain and perfect kind of government prescribed or commanded in the Scriptures of the Church of Christ.* . . . So that notwithstanding government, or *some kind of government*, may be a part of the Church, touching the outward form and perfection of it, *yet it is not such a part of the essence and being, but that it may be the Church of Christ without this or that kind of government*, and therefore the kind of government of the Church is not necessary unto salvation. (Whitgift's Works, vol. i, p. 184.)"

D.—Page 119.

The statement that the consecrations of Bishops White and Provoost was on the basis of the Prayer Book of 1785, was asserted in a sermon preached by the author of this little work some years ago, and subsequently published by request. The paper known as *The Churchman*, in a review of this discourse, took occasion to deny that the Prayer Book of 1785 was the basis on which the historic succession was secured to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and added that "any tyro in ecclesiastical history" could have corrected such a blunder. I have therefore thought fit to give in this appendix the following luminous statement of the historical facts in the case, collated by my brother, the Rev. Mason Gallagher, D. D., whose kindness in its preparation specially for this appendix, has added to the many obligations of a life-long friendship.

The Prayer Book of 1785, and the Historical Episcopate. By Rev. Mason Gallager, D. D.

That the "Historical Episcopate" was conveyed by the Church of England, and received on the basis of the Prayer Book of 1785, by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, is clearly seen in the Journals of the Conventions of 1785 and '86, as published by Bioren, Philadelphia, 1817.

From these Journals we quote:

"Wednesday 28th of September, 1785. On motion resolved, that a Committee be appointed . . . to consider of and report such alterations in the Liturgy, as shall render it consistent with the American Revolution, and the Constitutions of the respective States;

. . . that a Committee be appointed . . . to prepare and report a draft of an Ecclesiastical Constitution for the P. E. Church, and . . . that the preparing of the necessary and proposed alterations be referred to said Committee.

"Friday, 30th. Resolved that the Committee for revising and altering the Liturgy, etc., do also prepare and report a plain for obtaining the Consecration of Bishops, together with an address to the Most Reverend the Archbishop, and the Reverend the Bishops of the Church of England for that purpose.

"Tuesday, October 4th. Convention met pursuant to adjournment. Ordered that the consideration of the general Ecclesiastical Constitution be resumed, and that the same be read and considered by paragraphs; which being done, was considered by paragraphs, and the blanks filled up as agreed to, and is as follows:

"IV. 'The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England,' shall continue to be used by this Church, as the same is altered by the Convention, in a certain instrument of writing passed by their authority, entitled 'Alterations of the Liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in order to render the same conformable to the American Revolution, and the Constitutions of the respective States.'

"The Hon. Mr. Duane, from the Committee for revising, etc., reported that they had, according to order, prepared a plan for obtaining the Consecration of Bishops, and the draft of an address to the Most Reverend the Archbishops, and the Right Reverend the Bishops of the Church of England, and were ready to report the same.

"Wednesday, 5th October. . . . Resolved, that the Liturgy shall be used in this Church, as accommodated to the Revolution, agreeably to the alterations now approved of and ratified by this Convention.

"Ordered, That the plan for obtaining Consecration, and the address to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England be again read; which being done, the same were agreed to, and are as follows:

"First. That this Convention address the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, requesting them to confer the Episcopal character on such persons as shall be chosen and recommended to them for that purpose from the Conventions of this Church in the respective States. . . .

"Fourthly. That it be further recommended to the different Conventions, that they pay especial attention to the making it appear to their Lordships, that the persons who shall be sent to them for consecration are desired in the character of Bishops, as well by the Laity as by the Clergy of this Church in the said States respectively; and that they will be received by them in that character on their return."

In this address it is stated: "Our forefathers, when they left the land of their nativity, did not leave the bosom of that Church, over which your Lordships now preside . . . it was their earnest desire and resolution to retain the venerable form of Episcopal Government handed down to them as they conceived, from the time of the Apostles, and endeared to them by the remembrance of the holy Bishops of the Primitive Church, of the blessed Martyrs who reformed the doctrine and worship of the Church of England; and of the many great and pious Prelates who have adorned that Church in every succeeding age. The petition which we offer to

your venerable Body, is—that from a tender regard to the religious interests of thousands in this rising empire, professing the same religious principles with the Church of England, you will be pleased to confer the Episcopal Character on such persons as shall be recommended by this Church in the several States here represented.

"We have stated to your Lordships the nature and the grounds of our application: which we have thought it most respectful and most suitable to the magnitude of the object to address to your Lordships for your deliberation before any person is sent over to carry them into effect." . . .

"Resolved, That a Committee be appointed to publish the Book of Common Prayer with the alterations, as well those now ratified in order to render the Liturgy consistent with the American Revolution, and the Constitutions of the respective States, as the alterations and new offices recommended to this Church; and that the book be accompanied with a proper preface or address setting forth the reason and expediency of the alterations."

Journal of a Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, held in Philadelphia, from June 20th to June 26th, 1786.

"Thursday, June 22d, 1786. Ordered, That the letter from the Archbishops and Bishops of England to this Convention be now read, and it was read accordingly in the words following: 'London, February 24th, 1786. To the Clerical and Lay Deputies, etc. . . . The Archbishop of Canterbury hath received an address . . . from the Clerical and Lay Deputies, etc. . . . directed to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church

of England, requesting them to confer the Episcopal Character, etc. We are now enabled to assure you that nothing is nearer to our hearts than the wish to promote your spiritual welfare—and the enjoyment of that Ecclesiastical Constitution which we believe to be truly Apostolic—we cannot help being afraid, that in the proceedings of your Convention, some alterations may have been adopted or intended which those difficulties do not seem to justify . . . while we are anxious to give every proof not only of our brotherly affection, but of our facility in forwarding your wishes, we cannot but be extremely cautious, lest we should be the instruments of establishing an Ecclesiastical system which will be called a branch of the Church of England, but afterward may possibly appear to have departed from it essentially, either in doctrine or in discipline.'

"Resolved, That this Convention entertain a grateful sense of the Christian affection and condescension manifested in this letter: And whereas it appears that the venerable Prelates have heard, through private channels, that the Church here represented has adopted, or intended such alterations as would be an essential deviation from the Church of England, this Convention trusts that they shall be able to give such information to those venerable Prelates, as will satisfy them that no such alterations have been adopted or intended.

"Monday, June 26th, 1786. The Committee reported a draft of an answer to the letter from the Archbishops and Bishops of England, which, being read and considered, was agreed to, and is as follows: While doubts remain of our continuing to hold the same essential articles of faith and discipline with the Church of Eng-

land, we acknowledge the propriety of suspending a compliance with our request.

"We are unanimous and explicit in assuring your Lordships, that we have neither departed nor propose to depart from the doctrines of your Church. We have retained the same discipline and forms of worship as far as was consistent with our civil constitutions; and we have made no alterations or omissions in the Book of Common Prayer, but such as that consideration prescribed, and such as were calculated to remove objections, which it appeared to us more conducive to union and general content to obviate, than to dispute. It is well known that many great and pious men of the Church of England have long wished for a revision of the Liturgy, which it was deemed imprudent to hazard, lest it might become a precedent for repeated and improper alterations. This is with us the proper season for such a revision. We are now settling and ordering the affairs of our Church, and if wisely done, we shall have reason to promise ourselves all the advantages that result from stability and union.

"We are anxious to complete our Episcopal system by means of the Church of England. We esteem and prefer it, and with gratitude acknowledge the patronage and favors for which, while connected, we have constantly been indebted to that Church. These considerations added to that of an agreement in faith and worship, press us to repeat our former request, and to endeavor to remove your present hesitation, by sending you our proposed Ecclesiastical Constitution AND BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

"These documents, we trust, will afford a full answer to every question that can arise on the subject. We consider your Lordships' letter as very candid and kind;

we repose full confidence in the assurance it gives; and that confidence, together with the liberality and Catholicism of your venerable body, lead us to flatter ourselves, that you will not disclaim a branch of your Church, merely for having been, in your Lordships' opinion, if that should be the case, pruned rather too closely than its separation made absolutely necessary.

Journal of the Convention of the P. E. Church, held at Wilmington, Del., October 10th and 11th, 1786.

"Tuesday, October 10th. On motion the letters received from the Archbishops of England, with the form of testimonials and Act of Parliament, enclosed and referred to, be now read, and they were read accordingly, as follows: To the Committee, etc. . . . It was impossible not to observe with concern, that if the essential doctrines of our common faith were retained, less respect however was paid to our Liturgy than its own excellence and your declared attachment to it led us to expect, not to mention a variety of verbal alterations, of the necessity and propriety of which we are by no means satisfied. We saw with grief that two of the Confessions of our Christian Faith, respectable for their antiquity, have been entirely laid aside, and that even in that which is called the Apostle's Creed, an article is omitted, which was thought necessary to be inserted, with a view to a particular heresy, in a very early age of the Church, and has ever had the venerable sanction of universal reception.

"Nevertheless, as a proof of the sincere desire which we feel to continue in Spiritual Communion with the members of your Church in America, and to complete the order of your ministry, and trusting that these communications which we shall make to you on the subject

of these, and some other alterations, will have their desired effect, we have, even under these circumstances, prepared a Bill for conveying to us the powers necessary for this purpose.

"We most earnestly exhort you, . . . that you restore to its integrity the Apostle's Creed, in which you have omitted an article merely, as it seems, from misapprehension of the sense in which it is understood by our Church; nor can we help adding, that we hope you will think it but a decent proof of the attachment which you profess to the services of your Liturgy to give to the other two Creeds a place in your Book of Common Prayer, even though the use of them should be left discretional.

"The Committee appointed last evening to take into consideration the matters contained in the letter from the Archbishops of England, delivered in their report: . . . The first question taken on the report of the Committee was whether the words 'He descended into Hell' should be restored in the Apostle's Creed? Upon the Ayes and Nays being called for, the votes were as follows: New York, Divided; New Jersey, Aye; Pennsylvania, Divided; Delaware, Divided; South Carolina, Aye. So the words are to be restored, there being two ayes and no negative. On the question, 'Shall the Nicene Creed be restored in the Liturgy?' the same was unanimously agreed to. . . . It was moved and seconded that a Committee be appointed to draft a letter from this Convention to the Archbishops of England, in answer to their late letter. . . .

"This Committee retired, and after some time returned and reported a letter . . . as follows: To the Archbishops, etc. . . . We have taken into our most serious and deliberate consideration, the several

matters so affectionately recommended to us in those communications, and whatever could be done towards a compliance with your fatherly wishes and advice consistently with our local circumstances, and the peace and unity of our Church, hath been agreed to, as we trust will appear from the enclosed account of our Convention, which we have the honor to transmit to you, together with the Journal of our proceedings. We are, etc." . . .

Journal of a Convention of the P. E. Church, Philadelphia, July 28th to August 8th, 1789.

"Wednesday. July 29th, 1789. . . . The Convention met. Ordered, that the Rev. Dr. Smith, the Rev. Dr. Beach, and Mr. Andrews, be a Committee to prepare an address of thanks to the Most Reverend the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, for their good offices in procuring the consecration of the American Bishops."

The above verbatim copy of the Convention Journals of 1785, 6 and 9, would seem to render unnecessary any argument with respect to the statement that the Historical Episcopate of the P. E. Church was received on the basis of the Constitution and Prayer Book of 1785 and 6.

It was not until a fourth Convention in October, 1789, two years and eight months after Bishops White and Provoost were consecrated, that this Constitution and Prayer Book, specifically stated in the Preface to the Book, to be based on the Revision of 1689, were radically changed by a return to the principles and doctrines of the Revision of Charles II, 1662, such change being made the condition of the adhesion of Bishop Seabury and the loyalist clergy of New England. The

American Prayer Book, on which the Episcopate was received, was cast aside for the Anglican, and so remained until restored by Bishop Cummins and the Reformed Episcopal Church, thus representing legitimately the Church of the Revolution, as well as the Church of the Reformation, and both together, the Church of the Apostles, as nearly as we have it. Peace and purity were sacrificed in order to secure what has proved a hollow uniformity and a source of doctrinal corruption and chronic schism, and finally ecclesiastical disruption.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01210 8462